

PRICE, 25C.

THE
SO-CALLED HERESY CASE
AT GALT.

*Containing the Judicial Record and History of the Case
before the Courts of the Presbyterian Church
in Canada.*

*Texts of the Various Appeals and Answers to same by Session
of Knox Church, Galt, Presbytery of Guelph and
Synod of Toronto and Kingston.*

*Synopsis of the discussion and decision of the General
Assembly.*

HISTORY OF THE HOLINESS MOVEMENT IN GALT.

*Statement of Belief, Views, and Experience of the
So-Called Heretics.*

TWO REMARKABLE LETTERS BY A LAY PRESBYTERIAN

TORONTO :
IMRIE & GRAHAM, PRINTERS, COLBORNE STREET.

1889.

Copies of this Book can be obtained by applying to J. K. CRANSTON, Galt,
Ont., Wholesale and Retail Bookseller.

Religious Publications!

FOR SALE BY

JAMES K. CRANSTON,

Wholesale and Retail Bookseller and Stationer, - GALT, Ont.

Miscellaneous, Religious, Theological Books and Standard Works of Reference a Specialty. Sunday School, Private or Public Libraries supplied at the **LOWEST POSSIBLE PRICES.** Liberal Discounts to ministers and students. Cases of Library Books are sent on approval for selection when desired, or carefully selected. Books mailed free on receipt of price.

The following books are recommended to those who feel the need and have an appreciation of literature which helps to a better understanding of their glorious privileges in Christ Jesus :

DIVINE GUIDANCE.

BY THE EDITOR OF

"The Expositor of Holiness."

A book for the times. Contains a discussion of this important subject. Also the personal experiences of some of the GALT Heretics, and other living witnesses. 300 pages, well bound. Price - \$1 00

	Paper.	Cloth.
How We Are Saved; by J. A. R. Dickson. An excellent Holiness book.	25	
The Christian Secret of a Happy Life; by Hannah Whetstall Smith. This book is a precious portion to all who are hungering for a life of victory. Per doz., \$2.50 in paper.	25	50
The Open Secret; by H. W. Smith. This book unfolds to the Christian the fullness and sweetness of much of God's word.		I 25
Moody's Secret Power.	30	50
Moody on the Holy Spirit. Per doz., 50c.	05	
Personal Pentacost, the need of the Church, is dealt with in the above two books.		
Bagster's Saint's Rest, or Heaven Here and Hereafter.		35
Christ Crowned Within; by M. W. Knapp. This is a most helpful book.		75
Holiness Readings; by Mrs. Booth.	35	50
Godliness; " "	35	50
Aggressive Christianity; " "	35	50
Practical Religion; " "	35	50
Earnest Christians should read these books.		
Fullness of Joy; by Chas. A. Fox. We promise you a real treat in reading this book.		I 25
How to See Jesus with Fullness of Joy; by J. W. Kimball. This book will bring you help and joy.		75
Holy in Christ; by Rev. Andrew Murray.		90
Abide in Christ; " "		90
With Christ; " "		90
The Spirit of Christ; " "		90
God is owning and blessing these books in a wonderful way.		

THE
So-Called Heresy Case
AT GALT.

*Containing the Judicial Record and History of the Case
before the Courts of the Presbyterian Church
in Canada.*

*Texts of the Various Appeals and Answers to same by Session
of Knox Church, Galt, Presbytery of Guelph and
Synod of Toronto and Kingston.*

TORONTO :
IMRIE & GRAHAM, PRINTERS, COLBORNE STREET.

1889.

PREFACE.

This pamphlet is prepared to meet the wishes of those who desire to have a connected history of this case from its origin.

It will be seen that it is really a compilation of the various records and publications connected with the case in chronological order, with just sufficient original matter to connect the whole intelligently.

The reader will not find *all* the published matter which has appeared concerning this case. This would make a formidable volume as to size. But he will find it sufficiently full for all practical purposes.

The reports of all addresses of an apparently hostile character to the appellants are carefully clipped from newspaper reports, verbatim, so as to avoid the suspicion of unfairness.

All records in the official documents which have reference to charges of immorality have been purposely left out, for the reason that they were distinctly and unequivocally left out in the consideration of the case, both in the Synod and the Assembly. See pages 38, 39.

By some oversight on the part of those who furnished copy to the printers, two or three short minutes of Session meetings were omitted from the printed official documents, but, when read to the Assembly, they proved to be of such little value that we have not deemed it necessary to reproduce them.

We direct special attention to the two letters anent this case which appeared, during one of its stages, in the *Canada Presbyterian*, over the signature of "A Lay Presbyterian." They will repay a very attentive perusal.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

INTRODUCTORY HISTORY

TO

THE GALT, SO-CALLED, HERESY CASE.

In 1869 the town of Galt was visited by a great revival of religion under the labors of the Evangelists Russell and Carrol. This work of God, although not confined to Galt, spreading, as it did, over many neighboring places, yet because of the greater results witnessed there links itself in memory with Galt and chiefly with Knox Church.

Indirectly the present revival is the outcome of this work of grace, for its recognized leader, J. K. Cranston, was one of the many converts of that great revival.

Six years ago David Caldwell, who for upwards of thirty years had held membership in Knox Church, was led by a series of Providences to investigate for himself as to the possibility of securing a more satisfactory Christian experience than that enjoyed by himself and brother members of the Church, and after a variety of soul struggles was enabled to obtain his heart's desire concerning this thing.

It was while alone in the closet of prayer with his Bible that he saw his privilege of accepting God into his life, after the manner of the early Christians. He without hesitation delivered his whole being over to God, and received like them the Holy Spirit thereafter to be in his life the invisible yet recognized law or guide into all truth, and since then testifies to unbroken fellowship with Him.

This soul experience he at once began to tell to all with whom he came in contact, not refraining from public testimony in his church.

This action on his part soon awakened no little stir, and he was cited to appear before the Session to answer to a charge of *heresy*. Here he was twice examined, and threatened with a third examination, but then the matter was dropped.

Two years later he persuaded J. D. Cranston and some of his friends to visit a series of public services where this subject was the chief topic for consideration, and here his friends entered into the same spiritual experience.

This was not to them the simple outcome of some new doctrine heard for the first time and then accepted under the stimulus of high tide emotion, but was really the result of a lengthened period of examination of the subject, in the light of conscious unsatisfactory Christian experience, of listening to Mr. Caldwell's testimony, of close examination of his life lived in their presence, of study of the Word and of prayer.

As might be expected the united testimony of several witnesses awakened still greater interest in the subject of the higher life, and it was not long before many of their fellow church members began to enquire minutely concerning their improved experience and the way to secure like faith.

This naturally suggested the idea of having set times to meet the wants of such inquirers, and so the homes of Mr. Cranston and others were thrown open for all who were desirous of coming.

Particular care was taken to have no such gatherings during the times when services of a general character were held in Knox Church. But concerning district or cottage prayer meetings such precautions were not deemed necessary, for it was generally understood that these cottage meetings were simply intended to accommodate those who by reason of the distance or other hindrances were unable to attend the weekly prayer meeting at the church.

It was whilst thus occupied and with much success, not only in helping church members but also others outside the pale of the church, that the present trial was instituted, the different phases of which the following records will bring out and explain minutely.

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE OF J. K. CRANSTON.

During the great revival conducted by Russell and Carrol in Galt in 1869, I was converted to God. From that time I endeavored to live a Christian life. Being young and not receiving clear instruction, I understood but little of the work of the Comforter whom the Saviour promised should be to His redeemed ones an abiding guest, keeper and "guide unto all truth."—John xvi. 13

Leaving home when about 15 years of age, I went to Port Hope and there joined the Presbyterian Church, under the pastorate of the Rev. William Donald. Being desirous of living a true Christian life I attended the various services and Bible classes, and joined the Y.M.C.A. as an active member; with some others I distributed tracts every Sabbath.

Some four years after I secured a situation in Galt and became a member of Knox Church. I here sought to serve my Lord and Master, taking an active interest in Church and Sunday School work.

Leaving Galt, I was for some four years connected with Knox Church, Woodstock, and then again returned to Galt and engaged in the book and stationery business. I again sought to work for Jesus, whom I loved and endeavored to follow.

During all this time and up till September 4th, 1887, I realized that my experience was not a satisfactory one. I found daily that sin did have dominion over me, that the good I would that I did not, and the evil I would not I too often did. I did not have the power to obtain the victory steadily, so that often I would cry out in agony of soul, "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

I looked many times to my various ministers for help, and others who were God's professed children. By listening to their testimony I learned that their experience was similar to my own, and I noticed in their prayers that failure, yes, constant failure, was acknowledged and lamented, and the cry went forth: Woe is me, I am undone because I am a man of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the Lord of hosts.

I settled down, believing all Christians were alike and that no better experience could be enjoyed here, but heaven would be my home after this mortal body was laid aside, and so I lived in a half-dead state for nineteen years. At times I thought, surely there is a better way and would make enquiries, but all to no purpose, being invariably told that the seventh chapter of Romans described the best Christian experience in this life.

After returning to Galt, some four years ago, I heard a testimony given by Bro. David Caldwell that sounded new and strange to me. He testified that he had received not only Jesus as his Saviour, but also the Holy Ghost, in the Pentecostal sense and walked in Him, and that where once it had been frequent failure, that he now was enabled by the indwelling Comforter to obtain constant victory over the world, the flesh and the devil, and he declared that sin had not dominion over him while he walked in the Spirit. I was interested, and as he repeatedly gave his warm, glowing testimony and thanked God for His keeping power, I began to watch his life. I made his acquaintance, and for years the principal subject of conversation between us was how victory over sin was to be obtained.

I was blind to the truth, however, and thought he was deceived. But then his life was before me and I looked for evidence of failure there and I found none, so that I was compelled to believe that he had a power I knew nothing about. He said he had entered into rest and his life proved it to me.

I now began to realize that the way of Holiness spoken of in Isaiah xxxv. 8, 9, 10, was the path that all believers had the privilege of walking in while yet on the earth. But, how to enter in the way was the question. I became anxious and troubled and the Scriptures were searched daily, and my soul longed for deliverance from the power and dominion of sin; I longed to have the constant smile and approval of God. Beulah Land was before me. I saw the Land, but how to get across Jordan was the difficulty, I met with others who were dwellers in that land, and the fruits of Canaan were exhibited in these joyous, happy lives, and all my desire was to go forward. The situation was examined. I saw that it meant crucifixion and death to self, and a surrender of my will to God in all things small or great. I saw it meant consecration without reservation, as in Romans xii. 1—a presenting of myself, body, soul and spirit, unto God, which after all was only a reasonable service. I cried unto the Lord; I tried to die to self, to present myself to Him, but failed. I was in despair, the burden seemed greater than I could bear.

On the 4th September, 1887, Sunday afternoon, Mr. Caldwell and some other friends called and instructed me in the way more perfectly, and explained that by receiving the promised gift, the Comforter, the Spirit of God, as a person into my heart, He would enable me to be more than a conqueror over the world, the flesh and the devil.

Having previously accepted Christ as my Saviour I now received the Comforter divine as my empowerer, joy and guide into all truth; yielding myself with all my ransomed powers to God, I entered into an everlasting covenant to allow Him to work in me to will and to do His own good pleasure, and come what might I was the Lord's and His alone, to do whatsoever He commanded me.

I arose from my knees but did not experience any change of feeling; but what was better I had a conscious knowledge that I had honestly given myself and all my possessions to God, and that He had accepted me. I had nothing of my own left and I was willing to do anything or be used by Him as He saw fit.

The dear Lord whispered loving and tender messages to me and the joy of the Lord soon flowed like a river into my soul. The love of God was shed abroad in my heart by the Holy Ghost given unto me, a deep settled peace was mine. At last, at last, I cried, I am at rest, and I shall go no more out for ever. "Sweet happy rest." The land of Beulah was now entered into and the dear Lord communed with me and led me forth to conquer the enemies of the land. I was led up to the Jericho of my life and soon found that by walking with God the walls of difficulty disappeared and I was enabled to shout victory through the blood of the Lamb.

My past life was reviewed, and the dear Lord asked me, and gave me grace, to make confession and restitution to my fellow man for hasty and unkind words, actions and deeds that under temptation and provocation I had yielded to.

Having committed my business to the Lord, I was directed to put away and destroy all goods that were of a doubtful character. I debated for a time with reference to certain goods because every body in the business sold them, and I was soon convinced that God would not allow me to keep them, when I opened my Bible for counsel, Acts v., chap. 1 to 11 was before me and the matter was settled.

I now constantly realized the sweet comforting presence of my Lord and Master. I knew the blessed Spirit was my faithful guide. Enemy after enemy was conquered and my life from this time was and is to-day a joy and a song, because I have my beloved always with me. Temptations, trials and difficulties have ever been increasing, but I prove the scripture true: My grace is sufficient for you, for greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world.

Since entering this life hid with Christ in God, and walking in the Spirit, I have learned that it is not impossible to sin, but I also know and have proved that there is no longer any necessity for sinning. Absolute surrender and trust in my Guide makes it possible to obtain uniform victory over every assailant, and enables me to march forward, growing in grace and knowledge daily. I have found that to doubt the presence and leading of my Lord (because of the seeming difficulties of the way, or for any other cause,) leaves me exposed to the enemy of my soul, who at once thrusts in darts of sin. I have yielded to discouragement through apparent failure when I thought I had lost all, and it took several days of terrible soul agony to teach me that the only way was to lay aside my doubts and fears and instantly ask forgiveness and yield an unquestioning trust and obedience to my

Guide. I have now learnt that if I would be happy in Jesus there is no other way but to trust and obey—being willing to lose all that I may hold sweet fellowship and communion with my Saviour and my God.

The promise of the Lord in Acts i. 8, “Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses” has been verified. Our home was opened for meetings. Here the Lord’s presence has been wonderfully felt. Many saints have been cheered and helped out into a brighter experience, an sinners have been converted to God, and our one desire is that many more may enter into like precious faith, walk in the Spirit, so find in Jesus a satisfying portion.

I now fight the fight of Faith daily, and find I no longer wage an unequal warfare against the powers of evil.

I prove by the moment that “He that is able to keep us from falling,” keeps me and will present me before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy.

GALT, March 6th, 1889.

THE SO-CALLED HERESY CASE—AN EARNEST PROTEST.

MR. EDITOR,—I notice a short editorial in your issue of January 2, in which you quote from the *Globe* some statements of the Rev. Mr. Jackson, seriously reflecting on the Christian characters of the brethren and sisters recently suspended from communion in Knox Church, Galt. You further remark, that such “acts in themselves deserve suspension, altogether apart from the question of teaching heretical doctrines.” Without stopping at present to notice this position, to which I, for one, do not subscribe, I would remark that, when this editorial was written, you could scarcely have observed in the *Globe* of Dec. 29 (four days before the issue of your paper), an explicit contradiction by Mr. J. K. Cranston, of the allegations which you quote. Had you read that letter you surely would have cancelled the editorial, or else, in ordinary fairness, have quoted the contradiction as well as the charges. And I do not see how any candid reader could fail to be impress by the truthfulness of Mr. Cranston’s calm, Christian letter, borne out, as it is, by the Christian gentleness of all that has appeared from these brethren and sisters in their present trying position.

I notice, further, a second editorial, containing what seems to me a very gratuitous reflection on “our Methodist friends,” as well as on the letter of the Rev. James Harris. Here, again, you do not seem to have seen in the *Globe* of December 31 (two days

before your issue), the letter of the Rev. A. Traux, containing a contradiction as emphatic of the assertions which you have quoted from Mr. Jackson regarding him and closing with a seasonable hint as to the importance of making sure of facts before printing or circulating statements "injurious to the good name" of our fellow Christians, whether of our own or of any other denomination! I must add that I do not see any attempt whatever in the letter of the Rev. Mr. Harris to "make capital" out of the present unfortunate prosecution. His letter, on the contrary, seems to me very seasonable and very much to the point, in view of the present most salutary and Christian movement toward greater co-operation between Presbyterians and Methodists in Canada, so as to ensure a more sensible and beneficial distribution of Gospel privileges. For, if the principles which have guided the Galt Presbytery were to prevail generally in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, such Christian co-operation between brethren would be practically impossible. As it is, many Presbyterian ministers follow the brotherly practice of inviting any Christian members of other Churches who may be present at a communion season to sit down with them at the Lord's table. We are thus confronted with the spectacle of strangers sitting down at a Presbyterian communion table, holding the very same opinions for which attached and faithful members are publicly excommunicated! And if this Christian practice were ruled out, then, as Methodist ministers frequently occupy Presbyterian pulpits, we might see re-enacted the old story which we all have heard quoted as an instance of Baptist narrowness, now happily obsolete, when a Pædo-Baptist minister, who had preached the "action" sermon, was excluded from the table, and obliged to retire without partaking of the feast. In fact, there is no end to the un-Christian inconsistencies in which such principles would involve us.

It is scarcely possible to overstate in words the grief and indignation with which many earnest and loving Christian hearts—of Presbyterians as well as others—have been filled by the printed reports of the proceedings in this most miserable prosecution; reports which, as they are to be supposed unbiased, could scarcely do injustice to the prosecution. Many, indeed, have been astonished and bewildered, hardly knowing what to think of an action so unprecedented in their experience, and which, a few months ago, some of us would have deemed impossible in an age which is supposed to have learned something of the lesson taught by the bitter experience of the past—of the necessity of a broader Christian toleration in regard to difference of opinion. Hitherto the feeling excited has, with many, been almost too strong for ordinary language; but, lest the silence of sorrow and shame should be mistaken for that of indifference or acquiescence, I think it is time that some of it should find expression in behalf of the thousands of Presbyterian Christians who feel

that, before the Christian as well as the non-Christian public of this Dominion, their Church has been put, by official action, in what they consider a false position, against which they can scarcely enter too emphatic a protest.

The *fons et origo mali* to be a fundamentally wrong conception of what constitutes fitness for partaking of the Lord's Supper, and of the relation of Church organizations to that ordinance. It is, as Robert Hall asserted long ago, "the table of the Lord," and not the table of any particular branch of His Church. It is the table set for true believers, true followers of Christ, "whatever their name or sign; and no Church body, acting in the name of the great Head of the Church has any right to exclude from it—whether temporary or permanently—any one of His true followers who can approach it in sincerity and faith. It is the table of the "Church of the firstborn, whose names are written in heaven," and no branch of the visible Church has any right to exclude from it any true member of the invisible Church, simply because he or she cannot pronounce its particular shibboleth! Faith, love and obedience were the sole requisites known to the Apostles, and no Church which professedly founds its teaching on theirs has a right to demand tests of its own appointment, or bar the way to the Master's table with barricades of its own standards. When any Church—professing, as we all do, to "believe in the communion of the saints," cuts off from its communion any of Christ's faithful people, it takes upon itself the sin of schism, and must be held responsible accordingly. And of all "heresies," this heresy of dividing those whom Christ has joined together in the tender bond of common love, is, I think, the most deplorable.

It is, moreover, in contravention of the time honored principles and practice of the Presbyterian Church itself that such rigid conditions of conformity in opinion are demanded in her name. We are told in an official document, published by the Presbyterian Alliance, that she "never failed to distinguish between defiant contradictors and those able to yield only a general or partial assent, but willing to abide in her communion, wait on her teaching and seek from God further light and guidance." This is precisely the position of our suspended brethren, as distinctly defined in their own published letters.

Furthermore, the Directory of Church Government and Excommunication, drawn up by the Westminster Assembly, contains the following very distinct deliverance:

"Such errors as subvert the faith, or any other errors which overthrow the power of godliness, if the party who holds them spread them—these being publicly known to the just scandal of the Church, the power of excommunication shall proceed. But the persons who hold other errors in judgment about points wherein learned and godly men possibly may and do differ, we do not discern to be such against whom the sentence of excommunication for

these causes should be denounced." There can be no question that the "error" of our Galt brethren—if they be in error—belongs neither to "such errors as subvert the faith," nor to those which "overthrow the power of godliness," since it leads them to strive after the highest "power of godliness," as attainable by the Christian in this life. And as George Herbert well says:

"Sink not in spirit ; who aimeth at the sky
Shoots higher much than he that means a tree."

And, on the other hand, the point in question is one "wherein learned and godly men may and do differ," and, therefore, according to the authority quoted, a difference of opinion in regard to it is not a sufficient cause of excommunication. I maintain, therefore, that the action directed against these, our true Christian brethren, is opposed to the oldest ecclesiastical Directory of our Church, as well as contrary to the spirit of its great Head, who demands of his people that, whatever be their differences of opinion, they should be one in Him.

I shall reserve some further remarks for another letter.

A LAY PRESBYTERIAN.

THE SO-CALLED HERESY CASE AT GALT.

MR. EDITOR,—In my former letter I based a protest against the late ecclesiastical proceedings at Galt on the ground—first, that no Church, acting in the name of Christ, has the right to exclude from His table any of His true followers, even though they may not, in all points, be able to conform to its peculiar tenets; and, second, that any such action in the Presbyterian Church is not only opposed to the teaching of Christ and His apostles, but also to the best theory and practice of the Presbyterian Church itself. I quoted a passage distinctly proving this position from its old Directory on such matters, drawn up by the same Westminster Assembly which framed the Confession of Faith, and, therefore, of equally venerable authority. I now go on to the position that such excommunication as is there forbidden, on account of those "errors in judgment about points wherein learned and godly men possibly may and do differ," is also opposed to the best modern thought and practice of the Presbyterian Church.

It is true that, in those early times of conflict, when the heat of controversy overclouded men's Christian judgment and charity, as well as the distinction between vital issues of faith and differences of very secondary importance, communicants were expected to adhere, not merely to the Confession of Faith, or its older predecessors,

but also to the solemn League and Covenant itself! But when the mists of these times had at least partially cleared away, and men began to see that faith in Christ was not necessarily bound up with such a load of subsidiary matter, this inconsistency of the Church with her own avowed principle as to minor differences, fell into gradual disuse, and has so continued. The Shorter Catechism declares that what "is required to the worthy receiving of the Lord's supper" is "that they examine themselves of their knowledge to discern the Lord's body, of their faith to feed upon Him, of their repentance, love and new obedience." Nothing whatever is said of categorical inquisitions by Kirk Sessions as to their conformity to the Confession of Faith! I have been present at many communion seasons in this country, and at some in Scotland, and I never yet heard any minister in "serving the tables" tell the communicants that conformity with the Confession of Faith was a necessary condition of fitness for communion, though I have frequently heard the keeping of God's law and the exhibition of "the fruits of the Spirit" read as the "evidences" expected from the communicants. Nor in the administration of baptism have I ever heard it required of the parent that he bring up his child in due conformity with the Confession of Faith! Our Church, therefore, as a whole, wisely refrained from giving to her Standards, in regard to the mass of her people, a place never intended by its compilers, and which only a few extremists would desire. The late lamented Principal Tulloch, of St. Andrew's, has well said: "These creeds and confessions were neither more nor less than the intellectual ideas of great and good men, assembled for the most part in synods and councils, all of which, as our Confession itself declares, 'may err, and may have erred.' They are stamped with the infirmities no less than the nobleness of the men who made them. They are their best thoughts about the truth as they saw it in their time (intrinsically they are nothing more); and any claim of infallibility for them is the worst sort of Popery—that Popery which degrades the Christian reason, while it fails to nourish the Christian imagination." This is simply true, and the man who would excommunicate another because he does not hold his own favorite views in regard to sanctification or election, would, a few centuries earlier, have been willing to condemn men to death for disbelief in the infallibility of the Pope, or for disbelief in the Trinity, as the Presbyterians of Scotland actually wanted the Long Parliament to do! The growing influence of the Christian spirit has modified, outwardly at least, the persecuting spirit, but it still exists; as Dr. Oswald Dykes said in his inaugural discourse at the last Presbyterian Council, "Scholastic orthodoxy has frequently stepped in between the soul and the only Master to whom it owes allegiance, whence have sprung the divisions, the narrow-mindedness that nothing can destroy, save the return to the only authority we ought to recognize—that of Christ Himself." And in days

when this grand principle of Gospel liberty and simplicity is more fully recognized, and when a defiant unbelief is forcing Christians to sink their small points of difference in the great centres of agreement, it would be a curiously reactionary movement to make conformity with Presbyterian Standards a *sine qua non* for participation in the tender Memorial Feast! In that case, our Church would have to revise her phraseology. The answer in the Shorter Catechism would have to be changed into, "that they be examined as to their faith in the Standards, and their obedience to Kirk Sessions." The ordinance would have to be styled, "the Table of the Presbyterian Standards," and the very words of command into "This do in memory of them."

I hope that this Galt "case" will be settled by such a distinct deliverance on the subject as will forever prevent similar mistakes. It will be regarded with a widespread interest as a test case, concerning, as it does, thousands of Presbyterians in Canada. For the great mass of our communicants have never so much as looked into the Confession of Faith, and would be astonished, and in many cases somewhat shocked, if suddenly confronted with some of its statements. And it is hopeless to expect that, with Bibles in their hands, and the multitudes of modern helps to its study, people generally will ever think of sitting down to study an old document in antiquated phraseology, drawn up two hundred years ago, even by the most excellent of men! And no one can pledge himself to that of which he knows nothing. While, on the other hand, of the more thoughtful minority, there are thousands of Presbyterian Church members—and those not the least earnest and consistent—who neither hold, nor wish to be supposed to hold, every opinion expressed in the Confession of Faith; and who, if they were to be held as pledged to all its teaching by the act of communicating, would feel obliged, in honesty, to withdraw from the Church to which they are most attached, and seek one where they can communicate on the simple and scriptural ground of faith in the one Saviour, and love and obedience to the one Master. But the Church will have to be consistent. Either the Galt mistake will have to be retrieved, or a large proportion of her most intelligent members will have to be driven out on the same grounds. In that case we may possibly see the formation of a new Reformed Presbyterian Church, a consummation which on some grounds would be a great misfortune, and yet might become a necessity and even a blessing in the end. But for any such schism, the Church which should cut off from her communion the members of Christ's body would be alone to blame. The mistake made in the past by the Church of England, in driving out Non-conformists, might well warn against similar "divisive courses."

I do not attempt to discuss the special point at issue. To most people it does not seem a very serious "error" to believe that He who is able to keep us from falling will do it, the conditions being

complied with; or that St. Paul meant what he said when he prayed God "that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless until the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" or that our Lord was commanding what He knew to be an impossibility when He said, "Be perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect." I lately heard the most orthodox minister of a leading Presbyterian congregation say, before a general audience, that a true minister will always teach "a full and perfect redemption through Christ—a perfect regeneration and holiness through the Spirit." I think few would dare to say less, and, judging from their own explicit declaration of their views, I do not think that our Galt brethren mean to say more. As an abstract question, I regard that, as to how far sanctification can neutralize indwelling sin, as one of the metaphysical subtleties impossible to settle, because its very conditions elude our consciousness. We can know sin only in the act of sinning, in the sinful feeling, thought, act. Whether there are times in the experience of Christians when the power of the Spirit in them is so strong as to keep them from any conscious sin, is, in the end, simply a question of individual experience; and in this no one can judge for another. If our Galt brethren have, in any degree, deceived themselves and overstated their own experience, a truer and deeper knowledge of their own hearts, taught by that Divine Spirit to whom they look for guidance, will correct, in time, any such extravagance. What is called "error" is often simply the exaggeration of a truth which has been for a time neglected, when it is first vividly seen. The truth to which these brethren bear such glad witness of the high calling to which we are called, and the power of the Holy Spirit to keep us in it, is a truth which has been, to a great extent, left in the background. The high New Testament ideal of Christian life has not been sufficiently brought before our congregations, as binding on every Christian. This is the reason why the Bible "Standard of Morals," to which you editorially refer, is, for multitudes of average communicants, practically a dead letter! And yet those who strike a higher note are practically declared unworthy to sit down with the average Presbyterian communicant! I marvel much how any man calling himself a servant of Christ could bring himself to read such a deliverance from a Christian pulpit! What if they do, in the opinion of some, aim too high, expect too much of the Spirit? Old George Herbert tells us

"Who aimeth at the sky
Shoots higher much than he who means a tree!"

In days when infidelity taunts us, and with reason, for the practical inconsistencies of professing Christians, when so many lukewarm, careless, worldly-minded communicants sit down complacently at our communion tables, it is shameful and pitiable to exclude from them, even for a season, and who in their zeal

and love cannot suppress their testimony to their new-found treasure—the old apostolic truth that Christians are to be made “partakers of the divine nature,” to the very end that they may escape the corruption of the world through lusts! When our congregations are so full of unholiness, it is unfortunate that the ban of the Church should even seem to rest on those who are sincerely “following after holiness!” What of the veiled dishonesty of all kinds that so largely pervades business relations—the bank-swindlers, political corruption, newspaper unfairness, advertising lies, professional untruths, social falsehoods, oppression by employers? What of the “trusts” and “combines” which have been fitly characterized by high legal authority as “conspiracy against the public weal?” What of gross selfishness in all phases of life—of the indulgence of carnal passions? What of the cruel tongue of the backbiter, scattering sorrows and death? Are any of these things compatible with the divine command to “love thy neighbor as thyself?” Do not all these sins exist among Presbyterian Church members—even among Presbyterian office-bearers? And do our ministers, as a rule, denounce these crying sins of the day with the firmness and faithfulness that are needed? When the Church of Scotland was first constituted, everything that fell short of the perfect law became the subject of “discipline!” Can it be pretended that the Church lays any such stress on holiness of life now? I would not have the most inconsistent communicant excluded from the Lord’s table, if penitent for past sin and sincerely desirous of “new obedience.” But there is a strong spirit of unconscious Antinomianism widely prevalent, which is sapping the very life of our Christianity; and it will be a fatal mistake if our Church should, by any means, even appear to emphasize mere correctness of theory, above love and faith and purity of heart and life! “I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.”

I cannot help adverting, in passing, to the inconsistency of condemning any Christian people for holding religious meetings at the same time with those appointed by the Kirk Session. Has the Session a monopoly of certain times and seasons, and are their meetings an end or a means? There may be many circumstances which may make it expedient for church members to hold such additional meetings, and certainly one of these might well be found in holding meetings for the neglected, who are not usually found in our ordinary prayer-meetings. But when no Church Session would venture to interfere with any member who had a ball or a card party at his house on such evenings, or who attended such parties at those of others, and this is constantly done by Presbyterian Church members, sometimes even at the houses of elders; it is singularly inappropriate to find fault with the religious meetings, which, if real and earnest, could only be for the true prosperity of the congregation whenever and wherever held. And when we see “tableaux vivants” and other entertainments for church purposes,

so frequently gotten up by church members, it is no time to frown on those whose zeal for the souls of others may sometimes require other channels than those provided by the Session!

With a mass of heathenism abroad and of semi-heathenism at home, our Church has serious issues and serious work before her, for which she needs all her strength. If she begins to waste it in theological hair-splitting on points whereon true Christians see difficulty; if in a time when Christians generally are beginning to seek after unity by sinking minor differences, she begins to emphasize the points in which she differs from others; if, above all, before the keen eyes of a clear-sighted and critical scepticism, she appears to lay greater stress on an intellectual agreement with a rigid scholastic "orthodoxy" than on the manifestation of the "fruits of the Spirit," then she can only expect to fail miserably in fulfilling her high mission, and to share the fate of those who, when weighed in the balance, are found wanting!

A LAY PRESBYTERIAN.

—*Canada Presbyterian.*

THE APPEAL

TO

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada

OF

WM. HENRY, DAVID CALDWELL, JAMES K. CRANSTON,
JOHN D. CRANSTON, ALEX. B. CRANSTON,
LIZZIE MORTON, AND MRS. ALEX. KAY.

THE APPEAL OF WM. HENRY, DAVID CALDWELL, JAMES K. CRANSTON, JOHN D. CRANSTON, ALEX. B. CRANSTON, LIZZIE MORTON, AND MRS. ALEX. KAY, against the action of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston in dismissing their appeal against the decision of the Guelph Presbytery in sustaining the action and decision of the session of Knox Church, Galt,

Showeth as follows :

1. That we have not been guilty, nor have any one of us been guilty of any offence within the meaning of Rules 240 and 243 of Rules and Forms or any other rule rendering any private member of the Presbyterian Church amenable to discipline.

2. That no Church acting in the name of Christ has the right to exclude from His table any of His true followers, even though they may not, in all points, be able to conform to its peculiar tenets, and that any such action in the Presbyterian Church is not only opposed to the teaching of Christ and his apostles, but also to the best theory and practice of the Presbyterian Church itself. In proof of this we refer to its old directory on such matters, drawn up by the Westminster Assembly, which framed the Confession of Faith.

3. That we are conscious of nothing either in our lives or doctrines which should exclude us from our Church or her ordinances.

4. We still believe that the apparent differences in doctrine arise from the fact that as believers awakened to a sense of our

privileges in the Gospel, we have given hitherto our whole attention to active obedience to the commands of God, being desirous of living holy and blameless lives, to have the apostolic prayer fulfilled in us, "that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless until the coming of Christ."

5. We do experience and teach that the Holy Spirit comes and dwells with us as he did with the early Christians, that we have constant fellowship with Him, and follow Him as our guide into all truth. When we go before God in the closet of prayer we have His conscious approval and His peace and joy is our constant possession by abiding in Christ. Now we cannot yet believe that this Christian experience should make it impossible that we should continue membership in the Church of our choice. If in our life there is evil which men may see, we object not to be disciplined therefor, but cannot without the solemn decision of the highest court of our Church, believe that holy living is a disqualification for membership in the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

6. We protest that it is neither the teaching of the standards of our Church, nor of the Word of God that the Christian is to continue in sin that grace may abound. "Jesus came to save His people from their sins, not in them, Matt. i. 21. Who gave Himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works, Titus ii. 14. Chap. xx., clause 1 and 3, of Confession of Faith, states that the liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the Gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the law, and their being delivered from this present evil world, bondage to Satan, and dominion of sin, from the evil of afflictions, the sting of death, the victory of the grave and everlasting damnation, and also their free access to God and yielding obedience to Him, not out of slavish fear, but a child-like love and a willing mind. They who upon pretence of Christian liberty do practice any sin, or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty, "which is that being delivered out of the hands of our enemies we might serve the Lord without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life."

7. We protest against this matter being decided on any side issue, such as concerning the difference between sin and sinning. We know and experience that when we obey God we have peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and if we do not so obey Him we have condemnation, and so we exercise ourselves to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and man. Must we leave our Church the moment we succeed in having such a conscience?

8. Suppose we were to say we accepted the explanations of sinning given at Bowmanville, and say we sin in thought, word and deed, continually, in what respect would we be different from those who make no profession of religion, for what more can they do? We are not yet prepared to admit that infirmity or disability

is sin, or why would Paul say in 2 Cor., xii. 9-10, "Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in mine infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon me. 10 v. Therefore I take pleasure in mine infirmities in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake, for when I am weak then am I strong." We are, however, willing to be instructed if in error.

9. We believe it is our privilege, through the power of the indwelling Christ, to reckon our old man, with his evil tendencies, as crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin and be dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. And finally we direct your attention to the statement of our experience and views of the truth as it is in Jesus, as contained in the following statement of our belief and views.

We respectfully ask you to restore to us all rights and privileges before enjoyed by us, individually and respectively, and your petitioners will ever pray.

As witness our hands, this 24th day of May, 1889.

WM. HENRY,
DAVID CALDWELL,
JAMES K. CRANSTON,
JOHN D. CRANSTON,
ALEX. B. CRANSTON,
LIZZIE MORTON,
MRS. ALEX. KAY.

GALT, May 24th, 1889.

THE STATEMENT.

We, the undersigned, respectfully submit the following for the godly judgment of those whom it may concern:

1. We have held our membership in the Presbyterian Church as a result of clear, conscientious conviction concerning the Scripturalness of its doctrines.

2. We have, as far as our intentions could make it possible, been loyal members, (a) looking to its ordinances for spiritual help, and (b) laboring for its prosperity.

3. In our efforts to "grow in grace" we have, in the order of Providence, been led to study closely our privilege of accepting the Holy Ghost and walking in Him, as taught by Christ and illustrated by the early Christians. We made the discovery, that, notwithstanding our conversion to God was a positive fact in our Christian life, we had not received the Spirit to walk in Him in what appeared to us the pentecostal sense.

Since then we have accepted the Comforter after this sort, and for definite periods of time have walked in Him, recognizing in Him our joy

(Rom. xiv. 17): for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Also our Empowerer (Acts i. 8)—“For ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth” (Acts ii. 39): “for the promise is unto you and your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call,” (also Acts ii. 32, 33).

And our Guide (John xvi. 13)—“Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth, for He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will show you things to come,” (also v. 14) “He shall glorify me, for He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you.”

And our Teacher (John xiv. 26)—“But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you,” (also Heb. viii. 10; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27).

4. In giving this our experience, we by no means imply that other Christians have not received the Spirit to walk in Him, and have no dogmatic views concerning this thing. But would say that much of the work given us to do among believers has been in helping those who, like ourselves, realize that, having begun in the Spirit, they were trying to be made perfect by the flesh, as did the Galatians. (Gal. iii. 1-3): “Oh, foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you?” (2) “This only would I learn of you, received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?” (3) “Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?”

5. In emphasizing this definite work of the Spirit as

A PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

necessarily we have been brought to consider it in relation to the subject of sin, and thus far have settled the matter as follows: We realize in our own lives the truth of the statement of St. John (1 John iii. 6-10) that “Whosoever abideth in Him (Christ) sinneth not, whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither known Him.” (7) “Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous.” (8) “He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning; for this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil.” (9) “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin because he is born of God.” (10) “In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.” Also 1 John ii. 10; 1 John ii. 4; 1 John iii. 24, “And he that keepeth His commandments dwelleth in Him and He in him, and hereby know we that He abideth in us by the Spirit which he has given us.” 1 John iv. 4, “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them, because greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world.” Also 1 John iii. 18-22; 1 John v. 4, “For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world,

even our faith." Also 1 Corinthians x. 13; 1 John 5, "We know that whosoever is begotten (revised version) of God sinneth not, but He that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the evil one toucheth him not." Also Colossians i. 13; Ephesians vi. 11-18.

As Presbyterians, these and kindred passages we believe to be true, because

IN THE WRITTEN WORD OF GOD.

Now, we believe that the framers of the Confession of Faith intended that it (the Confession) should harmonize with and not antagonize the Bible, hence taking our stand on these Bible verities we expect to find no opposition to them in the standards of our Church.

As instances of the harmony that exists, we believe that when it is said that no mere man, since the fall, is able to keep the commandments of God perfectly, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed, they mean that no man not born of God according to the meaning of St. John, as expressed in the passages quoted.

The Scripture passages quoted in the standards (Rom. iii. 10-19), in support of the statement "no mere man," etc., to our minds, at least, seem conclusive.

Also in ch. iii., clause 6, of Confession of Faith, where it is stated that they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His spirit working in due season are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation. Scripture passages quoted in standards in support of above are Titus ii. 14; 2nd Thess. ii. 13; also 1 Peter, 1 and 5; chap. xx., clauses 1 and 3, Confession of Faith, on Christian liberty, which says:—"The liberty which Christ hath purchased for the believers under the Gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the law, and their being delivered from this present evil world, bondage to Satan, and dominion of sin, from the evil of afflictions, the sting of death, the victory of the grave and everlasting damnation, as also their free access to God, and yielding obedience to Him not out of slavish fear, but

A CHILD-LIKE LOVE AND WILLING MIND."

Chapter xx., clause 3, Confession of Faith, "They who, upon pre-tence of Christian liberty, do practice any sin or cherish any lust do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty which is that being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our lives."

The following are a list of Scripture passages as given by the (Confession of Faith) standards in support of these statements:—Ezek. xxvi. 27; Heb. viii. 10; Gal. iii. 13; i. 4; Col. i. 13; Titus ii. 14; Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. vi. 14; 1 Thess. i. 10; Rom. viii. 28; Rom. viii. 1, 14 and 15; and 1 John iv. 18.

Also (question 36, Shorter Catechism) the benefits which in this life do accompany and flow from justification, adoption and sanctification, are assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, increase of grace, and perseverance therein to the end. Passages in support are Rom. v. 1, 2, 5; xiv. 17; 1 John v. 13; Prov. iv. 18; 1 Peter i. 5.

If other and better methods of harmonizing the different expressions exist, we are ready and willing to be taught concerning this thing.

6. We have hitherto acted on the presumption that our Church teaches that the Bible is the true standard of orthodoxy, and that whilst our Church standards help to interpret the Scriptures they profess to be in complete harmony with them.

7. Therefore we repeat that, in accordance with the Bible teaching we believe that being born again and abiding in Christ we sin not, and with the standards of our Church we believe that no mere man can, in this life, keep the commandments of God perfectly, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed.

8. And we wish it to be clearly understood that all our answers and statements given at the various examinations, should in all fairness to us, be interpreted in strict accordance with this, our more thorough statement of belief, as at the examinations we had not the opportunity of giving a full statement of our views.

9. Should the ground be taken that the standards of our Church repudiate the deliverance of St. John, as quoted above, then it will only be necessary that this be established as the distinct deliverance of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, when at once we would cease even to desire to belong to its membership. But till then we shall look upon any action which in part, or in whole, puts us under disabilities as concerning attendance on the means of grace, or as participants in her ordinances, as an injustice, the outcome in all likelihood of misunderstanding, but none the less a calamity to be averted, if possible, by the use of all legitimate means, as we consider ourselves members entitled to Church privileges, having been received as such upon profession of faith in Christ and obedience to Him, as per clause 199 of Rules and Forms of our Church.

N.B.—The above we unitedly stand by as a statement of our belief.

As to our Christian experience of being born again we take no responsibility, the one concerning the other.

We judge one another, and expect the judgment of all, not on our profession, but on our lives.

If, therefore, any one fails to show forth the spirit of Christ in obeying the commandments, his profession we acknowledge to be vain.

As witness our hands this eleventh day of December, 1888, Galt, Ont.

JAMES K. CRANSTON,
JOHN D. CRANSTON,
DAVID CALDWELL,
ALEX. B. CRANSTON,
WM. HENRY,
LIZZIE MORTON.
MRS. ALEX. KAY.

Your appellants, therefore, pray that the said Presbytery cause the said Session to lift the sentence of suspension from Church privileges from them, and direct the said Session to restore to them all rights and

privileges before enjoyed by them individually and respectively, and your appellants will ever pray.

As witness our hands this 8th day of January, 1889.

WM. HENRY,
DAVID CALDWELL,
JAS. K. CRANSTON,
JOHN D. CRANSTON,
ALEX. B. CRANSTON,
LIZZIE MORTON,
MRS. ALEX. KAY.

Answers on behalf of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston to the reasons of appeal to the General Assembly of Wm. Henry, David Caldwell, James K. Cranston and others against the action of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston in dismissing their appeal against the Presbytery of Guelph in sustaining the action and decision of the Session of Knox Church, Galt.

1. This reason is the statement of an opinion in which the Session of Knox Church, Galt, the Presbytery of Guelph and the Synod of Toronto and Kingston do not concur. Rule 243 quoted, says "An offence is anything in the principles or practice of a member of the Church which is contrary to the Word of God," and such an offence is what has been charged against these appellants, and, in the judgment of the Synod, proved.

2. This reason is irrelevant inasmuch as the appellants have not been excommunicated, but suspended. Had the appellants, moreover, considered it necessary to make a reference to the Westminster Directory on Church Government, they should have given some indication of the portion of that document to which they refer, as others who have examined it have failed to find any specific statement of the grounds of excommunication, or any language which even remotely resembles the language of this reason. They have found, however, that it is distinctly declared under the head of Congregational Assemblies, that "Authoritative suspension from the Lord's Table of a person not cast out of the Church is agreeable to the Scripture." Among other reasons given for this statement is the following, viz: "Because we are charged to withdraw from those who walk disorderly."

3. This is not surprising, and is of no importance, inasmuch as the appellants avow that for longer or shorter periods they have attained to a state wherein they have no consciousness of sin.

4. The difference in doctrine is not only apparent but real. The mild language of this reason does not accord well with the aggressive attitude assumed by the appellants in Knox Church, Galt, in asserting in the most public manner their peculiar notions, or with their determination openly avowed before the Synod of continuing to teach their erroneous views.

5. The experience which they profess is one to which there is no parallel in any which is recorded in the New Testament. They assert that they have for periods of greater or less duration attained a state

wherein they had no consciousness of sin and no need to ask forgiveness. This element in their alleged experience they here entirely omit, and call attention to descriptions of it, which, whether true or untrue, have not been made the ground of charge against them, and end by insinuating that in the lower courts "holy living" is made "a disqualification for membership in the Presbyterian Church in Canada." It is unnecessary to say that there is no foundation for this accusation.

6. This protest is only another phase of the false accusation which we have pointed out under the previous reason. No one connected with Session, Presbytery or Synod has either directly or indirectly indicated that the teaching of the Standards of our Church or of the Word of God is that the Christian must continue in sin that grace may abound. This protest does not rise above the dignity of a slander. And the beautiful quotation which the appellants introduce from the Confession of Faith only serves to illustrate their painful incapacity to understand the Spiritual doctrine of holy living.

7. We are not aware that it has ever been proposed to decide this matter on a side issue. We submit, however, that when the question is whether it is true and whether it is safe to teach that Christians in this life can reach a state in which they have no sin which needs to be confessed and pardoned, whether indwelling sin is present in the human heart in every stage of the Christian's earthly life and is truly and properly sin, is no side issue, but one which every man who is not willing to live under a delusion must settle for himself by a careful examination of the Word of God and the workings of his own heart.

8. It is difficult to imagine that the appellants could have attached any weight to this reason themselves. For surely they are capable of understanding that although it is true that believers sin daily in thought, word and deed, this is not all that is true of them, either according to our Standards or the Word of God. They teach that in the believer the dominion of sin is broken, and that the power of sin is gradually growing weaker, while grace is waxing stronger and stronger. Not one of these things can be correctly affirmed of unregenerate persons. The reference to 2 Cor. xii. 9-10, shows how the appellants, under the influence of a false theory, misunderstand Scripture and confound mere natural weaknesses with moral infirmities.

9. This reason is chiefly made up of Scripture phrases all excellent, when properly understood, but so joined together as to indicate that the appellants have very confused notions of the distinction between justification and sanctification, and have failed to apprehend the relation which the finished work of Christ sustains to these two great privileges of the Gospel.

Knox Church, Galt, April 26th, 1888. The which day the Kirk Session met and was constituted with prayer by Moderator, the Rev. Dr. Smith.

Inter alia, in response to request passed at last meeting, the following persons appeared before the Session, viz., William Henry, David Caldwell, James K. Cranston, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay, and Alexander Cranston.

A lengthened conference was held with these persons as to their views. They all distinctly avowed what are well known as holiness or sinless perfection views, and described themselves as living in this condition, and deplored what they considered the unscriptural views, and consequently low condition of the Church on this subject. *When scriptural passages were cited in support of the progressive view of sanctification, and the need of daily confession of sin, they refused to be instructed thereby. It was also well known that for some time they had been diligently propagating their views among the members of this Church. They were asked to withdraw, and after lengthened deliberation the Session passed the following resolution :*

That in view of the unscriptural and unpresbyterian position of these persons, in holding and maintaining before this Session what are commonly known as holiness or sinless perfection views, and their persisting to hold them, when kindly and faithfully dealt with by the Session ; inasmuch as they have been sedulously disseminating those views among the members of this Church, by conversation, by teaching in the Sabbath School, and by holding frequent meetings in houses for this purpose ; and inasmuch as they have persuaded some members of this Church to adopt their views, *thus disturbing the peace and harmony of this church*; the Session resolve, that unless they renounce those views, or cease to teach them, and promise to live in harmony with the faith of this Church on the doctrine of progressive sanctification, their names be erased from the Roll of this Church, with the prayer that the Spirit of Christ may use this discipline of the Church as a means to their restoration to what this Church holds to be the true scriptural faith on this subject.

Knox Church, Galt, May 14th, 1888. The which day the Kirk Session met and was duly constituted.

Inter alia, William Henry, David Caldwell, James K. Cranston, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay, and Alexander Cranston, the parties cited, having compeared, and having had read to them the resolution passed at a former meeting ; being asked what they proposed doing, Mr. John Cranston declared, that he was going on as he had been doing, in the good work of the Lord, and so said they all, each one for himself and for herself. And the following resolution was carried unanimously.

That in accordance with the resolution read to these parties,

their names be erased from the Communion Roll of the congregation. And in accordance with the constitution of the Sabbath School, declared incompetent to be teachers therein.

Extracted from the minutes of Session by James Cowan, Session Clerk.

Galt, May 18th, 1888.

THE PROTEST AND APPEAL of WM. HENRY, DAVID CALDWELL, JAS. K. CRANSTON, JOHN D. CRANSTON, LIZZIE MORTON, MISS ALEX. KAY, AND ALEX. B. CRANSTON, against the action and decision of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt.

To the GUELPH PRESBYTERY of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.
Respectfully sheweth as follows :

1. That on or about the 24th day of April, 1888, we were individually served with a paper writing directed to each one of us respectively, and containing the words and figures following :

GALT, April 24th, 1888.

DEAR SIR OR MADAM,—At a meeting of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, held on the 18th inst., a resolution was passed requesting you to appear at a meeting of the Session to be held in the Session Room in the basement of the church on Thursday evening, the 26th inst., at 7.30 o'clock, to answer to the charge of holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. (Signed), JAMES COWAN,

Session Clerk.

2. In answer to the said request, we appeared before the Session at the time and placed named, and objected to being dealt with on the following grounds :

1st. That the said citation was irregular in that it did not fulfill the requirement of Sections 268 and 269 of the Rules and Forms of Procedure adopted by the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

2nd. That no definite charge was stated in the said citation, showing wherein we were holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, as regarded by the forms in that behalf, on pages 62, 63, and 64 of above-mentioned (R and F.)

3rd. Our objections were sustained by the Moderator, Dr. Smith, and no legal trial was then had.

4th. On or about the 4th day of May, 1888, we individually received a communication in the words and figures following :

GALT, May 4th, 1888.

TAKE NOTICE—That you are summoned to appear before the Session of Knox Church, Galt, at 8 o'clock, p.m., on the 7th day of May, 1888. Served this 4th day of May, 1888, by appointment of Session.

(Signed),

JAMES COWAN,

Session Clerk.

5th. On or about the 7th day of May, 1888, we each received a notice, of which the following is a true copy :

GALT, May 7th, 1888.

TAKE NOTICE—That the meeting of Session to which you were cited to appear, has been postponed to Monday, the 14th day of May, 1888, at 8 o'clock, p.m.

(Signed),

JAMES COWAN,
Session Clerk.

6th. In pursuance of said summons and notice of adjournment, we attended the meeting of Session held on the 14th day of May, 1888.

7th. We again raised similar objections, and pointed out to the court that Rules 254, 256, and 257 had not been complied with ; but all our objections were overruled. We were not allowed to defend ourselves. The Moderator, the Rev. J. A. R. Dickson, saying that prisoners at the bar were not allowed to quote law to the judge ; so that no trial whatever was had.

8th. The appellants further claim that they have been guilty of no offence rendering them liable to discipline in the Presbyterian Church of Canada, as defined in Articles 240 and 243 of said Rules ; nor has it been pretended that they are guilty of any such offence.

9th. The appellants further say that no charge other than the above has ever been laid against any one of them, so far as they are aware, nor does any " fama " exist against any of them which endangers the honor of religion or is condemned by the Scriptures.

10th. Notwithstanding the fact that regular notice of protest and appeal against the decision of the said Session was given, the said Session caused notices to be sent to appellants Jas. K. Cranstoun, Mrs. Alex. McKay, and Lizzie Morton, of which the following is a true copy :

GALT, May 18th, 1888.

TAKE NOTICE—By the decision of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, your name has been erased from the Communion Roll ; and, in accordance with the constitution of the Sabbath-school, declared incompetent to be a teacher therein.

By order of the Session,

(Signed),

JAMES COWAN,
Session Clerk.

For the reasons above alluded to, among others, we beg respectfully to protest and appeal against the action of the said Kirk Session, which said reasons are, amongst others :

1st. We have not been guilty, nor have any of us been guilty of any offence within the meaning of Rule 243, or any other rule, rendering any private member of the Presbyterian Church

amenable to discipline, having for its object the glory of God, the purity of the Church, and the spiritual good of the appellants.

2nd. None of us have been served with the copy of any definite charge laid against us, nor, in fact, has any definite charge been laid against us, or any one of us, by any one.

3rd. When we appeared before the said Session, on the 14th inst., we were not permitted to defend ourselves in any way against the imputations against us, but were refused a hearing, as above stated.

The whole proceedings, as detailed, are irregular, so that we had no legal trial whatever according to the procedure laid down in the Rules and Forms of our Church. We each for himself and herself repudiated and denied holding and teaching the erroneous doctrine attributed to us at the meeting of April 26th, 1888.

Your appellants, therefore, pray that the said Presbytery cause the action of said Session in causing the names of the appellants to be erased from the Communion Roll to be annulled, and that the said Session be directed to re-enter the names of the appellants on the Communion Roll of the said Church, which have been erased, and reinstate them to all rights and privileges before enjoyed by them individually and respectively, and your appellants will ever pray. As witness our hand this 22nd day of May, A.D. 1888.

WM. HENRY,
DAVID CALDWELL,
JAS. K. CRANSTON,
JOHN D. CRANSTON,
LIZZIE MORTON,
MRS. ALEX. KAY,
ALEX. B. CRANSTON.

The appeal was heard at Guelph, November 19th, and sustained and the case was referred back to the Session of Knox Church, assessors being appointed to sit with the Session of Knox Church, Galt, when hearing the case.

At Guelph, and within Chalmers' Church, the eighteenth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Presbytery of Guelph met according to appointment, and was constituted *sederunt*. Mr. Alexander MacKay, D.D., Moderator, *pro tempore*, etc.

Inter alia the Presbytery took up a protest and appeal by Mr. William Henry and six others against the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in removing their names from the Communion Roll of that congregation, with the prayer that said action be annulled, and that the Session be directed to re-enter their names on the Roll, and reinstate them in all the rights and privileges before enjoyed. The clerk stated that he had issued

notices to all concerned, and summoned them to appear for their interests at this meeting. Parties having been called it was found that all were present, and they took their places at the bar. The appellants were then heard in support of their protest and appeal. The Kirk Session of Knox Church was heard in explanation and justification of their procedure. The minutes of Session bearing on the case were read. The appellants were heard in reply. Questions were put to both parties and answered, after which they were removed, and the Presbytery proceeded to deliberate. It was then moved and resolved, that further consideration of the case be postponed till next regular meeting of Presbytery, and that the protest and appeal lie upon the table in the meantime.

Extracted from the records of the Presbytery of Guelph,

ROBERT TORRANCE,

GUELPH, 24th April, 1889.

Pres. Clerk.

At Guelph, and within Chalmers' Church, the twentieth day of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Presbytery of Guelph met, according to appointment, and was constituted sederunt. Mr. Henry Edmison, M.A., Moderator, etc.

Inter alia the Presbytery proceeded to consider the protest and appeal of William Henry and others against the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in removing their names from the Communion Roll, with the prayer that they be re-instated in their former standing and privileges. The protest and appeal were read. Mr. Dickson, was heard from the Session so that the matter might be fresh before the court. After lengthened deliberation it was moved by Dr. Middlemiss, seconded by Dr. Wardrope, "That with a view to the satisfactory issuing of the case the Presbytery instruct the Session of Knox Church, Galt, to prepare a reference of the matter, containing a full and careful statement of the errors alleged, and lay the same before the Presbytery at an adjourned meeting to be held on an early day in Galt, with extract minutes of their procedure."

While the motion was under consideration the usual hour of adjournment arrived, and the Presbytery adjourned to meet in the same place at a quarter past two o'clock in the afternoon, and the sederunt was closed with the benediction.

Same day and place at a quarter past two o'clock in the afternoon, sederunt as in the forenoon.

Inter alia the Presbytery resumed consideration of the protest and appeal against the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in the case of William Henry and others, when after further deliberation, it was moved by Mr. Tait, in amendment to the motion of Dr. Middlemiss in the forenoon, seconded by Mr. John Davidson, "That the Presbytery having heard the protest and

appeal, and also the statement of the Session in reply, regrets that it is not yet in possession of the necessary data for coming to a right decision in the case, and in order to receive all the necessary information regarding the views of the appellants, and, also, to give them the full benefit of what they consider the law of the Church, the Presbytery appoints the following brethren to act as assessors with the Session, to go, if thought necessary, over the whole ground again, and to report to a meeting of Presbytery held three weeks from to-day in this place. The Rev. Drs. Wardrope, Torrance and Middlemiss, Messrs. J. C. Smith, and J. B. Mullan, with Mr. Charles Davidson and Professor Pantou."

After further discussion the vote was taken on the amendment as against the motion, when the amendment was declared carried by a large majority, and the Presbytery decided accordingly.

Parties were then recalled and the decision of the Presbytery was announced to them in which they acquiesced.

Extracted from the records of the Presbytery of Guelph.

ROBERT TORRANCE,

GUELPH, 24th April, 1889.

Pres. Clerk.

At Galt, and within Knox Church, there, Saturday, the twenty-fifth day of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight years, at seven o'clock in the evening, which time and place the Session of Knox Church met in accordance with the call of the Moderator, and was constituted with prayer by the Moderator, Rev. Alex Jackson.

Inter alia the Moderator reported that the Presbytery of Guelph had referred back the case of William Henry, David Caldwell, Jas. K. Cranston, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay and Alexander Cranston to the Session to prepare it for proper reference to the Presbytery. He also advised the Session that Presbytery had appointed eight Assessors to sit with the Session, and that he had called a special meeting of Session to be held in the Lecture Room, on Tuesday, the 27th day of November, 1888, and had advised the Assessors of said meeting. He had also caused to be served on the said William Henry, David Caldwell, Jas. K. Cranston, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay and Alex. Cranston a copy of the following citation properly signed by the Clerk.

To William Henry (and so of the rest):

You are hereby required to appear before the Session of Knox Church, at a meeting to be held in the Session Room of the church, on the twenty-seventh day of November current, being next Tuesday, at the hour of two and a-half o'clock of the afternoon (2.30 p.m.), to answer to charges of holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church

of Canada and of pursuing a divisive course in respect to said Knox Church, or either or both of them, made against you by said Session.

Dated this twenty-third day of November, 1888.

JAMES COWAN,

GALT, Ont.

Session Clerk.

Elder Allen H. Goodall certified that he had served a correct copy of the above citation on several of the accused and had delivered the remainder to Elders Pringle and Macpherson to serve them on the others. The proper certification was deferred until the meeting of Session on Tuesday, twenty-seventh instant.

The Clerk was instructed to prepare a properly certified minute of all the proceedings in the case of William Henry and others and submit it to Session and the Assessors of Presbytery at the meeting on Tuesday next.

Extracted from the records of the Session of Knox Church.

JAMES COWAN,

GALT, Ont., November 26th, 1888.

Session Clerk.

At Galt, and within Knox Church, there, the twenty-seventh day of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Kirk Session of Knox Church met and was constituted with prayer, Dr. Wardrope leading therein at the request of the Moderator. Present Mr. Alexander Jackson, Moderator, Mr. James Cowan, George G. Nichol, Walter Tait, Charles McKilligan, John W. Murray, Jas. Beattie, Duncan Gillies, Robert G. Struthers, William Slater, George McCallum, John Young, Allan H. Goodall and Andrew Taylor, with Drs. Wardrope, Middlemiss and Torrance, and Mr. J. C. Smith, B.D., ministers, and Messrs. Charles Davidson and James Hoyes Panton, ruling elders, who had been appointed by the Presbytery of Guelph at its last meeting as assessors.

The minute of Presbytery containing the names and appointment of the assessors was read.

The object of the meeting was stated by the Moderator.

On motion, it was agreed that Dr. Torrance be requested to act as clerk *pro tempore*.

Mr. J. A. R. Dickson, B.D., a former Moderator of Session *pro tem*, was requested to take a seat among the members that they might have the benefit of his counsel.

A duly certified extract of Presbytery bearing on the case was produced and read.

A document was placed in the hands of each of the members containing extracts, in a printed form, from the minutes of the Session of Knox Church, of their dealing with John D. Cranston and others, beginning with the twelfth day of March of the present year down to the present date, and the same were compared

with the manuscript records of the Session, and were found to be correct. Said document also contained extract minute of Presbytery on the case as it came before them, of date of the 26th instant.

Attention having been called to the fact that there was no mention in the minutes of the 14th of May that the persons whose names are there given had appealed from the finding of the Session, it was admitted that such appeal had been taken although the record of it had been omitted.

The minutes of the last two meetings were read and sustained.

The Moderator stated that, as the printed document bore, the following citation had been served upon each of those who had appeared as appellants before the Presbytery, "You are hereby required to appear before the Session of Knox Church," etc., (See record of Session, 25th November) and evidence was produced that the citations had been duly served.

On motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Dr. Wardrope, it was agreed that a committee consisting of Dr. Middlemiss, convener, Dr. Torrance, Mr. J. C. Smith and James Cowan be appointed to draft a set of questions to be put to the accused for the purpose of learning more satisfactorily the doctrinal views on the points of which they are charged, and of judging whether or not they are in harmony with the Standards of this Church, and submit the same to the Session at two o'clock in the afternoon. Mr. Dickson was requested to meet with the Committee and give them any assistance he might be able.

The Session then adjourned to meet at two o'clock in the afternoon and the sederunt was closed with prayer.

At two o'clock in the afternoon the Session met according to adjournment and was opened with prayer. Sederunt the same as in the forenoon, with the addition of Messrs. Thomas Rutherford, Robert Gibbon, James Dixon, Adam Hood and T. W. Vardon, M. D.

Reasons were assigned for the absence of Mr. J. B. Mullan, one of the assessors, from the meeting.

The record taken of the business in the forenoon was read and accepted as correct.

The committee appointed to draft a set of questions to be put to the accused gave in their report, recommending six questions, based upon the Standards of the Church, and designed to bring out the views of the accused on the matters of doctrine on which they are charged, with a special one to John D. Cranston who had previously resigned his position as an elder of Knox Church, on the ground that he found himself not to be in harmony with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and the same were approved, and it was agreed that the putting of them be committed to Dr. Middlemiss under the direction of the Moderator.

On further deliberation it was resolved that each of the accused be

called before the Session separately, that the questions be read to him, that his answers be taken down by the clerk, and read over to him at the close of the examination, and his assent to their correctness asked, after which he shall be discharged from further attendance unless required.

At the request of the Moderator, Mr. Smith led in prayer for the special guidance of the Spirit of God in the conducting of the examination.

The accused were then called in the following order, their replies taken down and read over to them, each of them assenting that the record was a faithful statement of his answers, namely, William Henry, David Caldwell, James K. Cranston, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay and Alexander Cranston.

On further consultation as to the next duty of the Session it was resolved that, in terms of the minute of Presbytery, they report their proceedings to that court at the adjourned meeting to be held in Chalmers' Church, Guelph, on the 11th day of December next, and that they meet again in this place in a week from Saturday next, that is on the ninth day of December, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, to consider the minute of this day's proceedings.

The serunt was closed with prayer and the benediction by the Moderator.

ROBERT TORRANCE,
Clerk.

AUTHENTICATED COPY OF QUESTIONS

Put to William Henry and others, appearing as summoned, before the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, on the 27th day of November, 1888, to answer to charges of holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and of pursuing a divisive course in respect to said Knox Church, or either or both of them made against them by said Session, with the answers thereto.

QUESTIONS:

I.—Do you believe that in the case of any man such grace is given in this life that he can perfectly keep the commandments of God, and doth not daily break them in thought, word and deed?

II.—Do you believe that in any case the believer is, in this life, delivered from the inbeing of sin?

III.—Do you believe that any mere man is, in this life, able to perfectly keep the commandments of God?

IV.—Do you believe that there are any seasons in the experience of the believer when he does not need to confess sin?

V.—Do you believe that there are any seasons in the earthly experience of the Christian when he can dispense with the confession of sin and asking pardon for it?

VI.—Have you held or attended services carried on simultaneously with the services held under the direction of the Session of this Church?

VII.—To Mr. John D. Cranston: Have you changed your doctrinal views since you resigned the office of the eldership?

ANSWERS:

William Henry having been called and the first question put to him, he replied "Yes." And on the question being repeated, his reply again was "Yes."

In reply to the second question, Mr. Henry stated, "Yes, I believe that he can be delivered." And on repeating the question, he affirmed, "I believe that he is delivered from the inbeing of sin."

Q. Third: Ans.—"Christ in me." On the question being repeated, he answered that "Christ may be so in a man that in this life he can perfectly keep the commandments."

Q. Fourth: "As soon as I know that it is sin, I confess it. I am conscious of sin, if I sin. Can only answer for myself that I was never in that state. Do not confess it unless I know it." The question was repeated and the reply was given: "Yes, there have been days in my life in which I have had no need to confess sin, because I was kept from sin by the power of the Holy Ghost."

Q. Fifth: "There have been seasons in my own experience when I did not need to confess sin."

Q. Sixth: "I have attended when public services were going on, but not district prayer meetings." On the question being repeated he replied, "No, I have not."

Mr. Goodall asked through Dr. Middlemiss, "Did Mr. Henry attend a prayer meeting when the district prayer meeting was going on?" Ans.—No.

By Dr. Vardon through Dr. Middlemiss, "Has Mr. Henry been in the habit of teaching in accordance with the answers now given?" Ans.—Yes.

The answers having been read over to Mr. Henry, in connection with the questions, he stated that they had been correctly taken down.

John D. Cranston having been called and the questions put to him in the same order, he replied as follows:—

Q. First: "I believe that the power of God is sufficient to enable us to keep the commandments. Question repeated. Reply, "I believe that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Question repeated. Reply, "I believe that when a person makes an entire surrender

of himself to God, grace is given to him to keep the commandments. I realize that this is my experience."

Q. Second: "Yes I do. I believe that it is our privilege to be cleansed from sin and from all unrighteousness."

Q. Third: "No, I do not." Question repeated in the form "Do you believe that any man except Christ is, in this life, able to perfectly keep the commandments of God?" Ans.—"When a man makes an absolute surrender of himself to God, and receives the gift of the Holy Ghost, he is kept from sin. I believe that it is possible."

Dr. Vardon through Dr. Middlemiss asked, "Do you believe that you yourself with the grace given you have been enabled perfectly to keep the commandments of God at any time?" and Mr. Cranston replied, "I realize that God is keeping me from sin by His almighty power, and that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. There have been days when God has kept me from committing sin."

Q. Fourth: "Yes, I do."

Q. Fifth: "I do."

Q. Sixth: "Yes, I believe we have. Do not know how many times." The meaning of the question having been more fully explained, Mr. Cranston answered that they had been carrying on meetings not under the direction of the Session, and he had had a series of meetings which occasionally conflicted with those under the Session.

Special question: "He has not so far as he knows his own heart."

By Mr. Murray through Dr. Middlemiss: "Have you taught others throughout the congregation or community in accordance with the answers you have now given?" "Yes, I have, and am at present holding meetings in Rockton."

The above answers having been read over to Mr. Cranston, in connection with the questions, he declared them to be correct.

David Caldwell was then called and the questions having been put to him he replied as follows:—

Q. First: "I answer in this way: That where sin abounded grace did much more abound." The question was repeated and the answer given, "Certainly, I do believe this."

Q. Second: "Sin does not dwell any longer in him, I do believe that."

Q. Third: "No, I do not believe that a mere man is able." Question.—"Do you believe any man with the exception of Christ has been able to keep the commandments of God?" Ans.—"I believe there are such."

Q. Fourth: "Yes, I believe so. He is kept from committing sin."

Q. Fifth: "I believe there are such seasons. Think I have answered that already."

Q. Sixth: "I do not know whether or not. Have held services on Sabbath afternoon when there was no service in the Church, also on Tuesday and Friday evenings, but ain not aware if they have conflicted with Church services. Have attended meetings in a district when the district prayer meeting was going on. Did not ask any one to leave his own meeting."

To the question "Have you been in the way of teaching doctrines in accordance with the answers just given?" Mr. Caldwell replied that he has been teaching elsewhere than in Galt. All round where there have been open doors. Is aware when he is at Church, from the announcements made from the pulpit, that these district prayer meetings are held on Tuesday and Friday evenings.

The answers were read over to Mr. Caldwell, with the questions, and he stated that they were correctly taken down.

James K. Cranston called.

Q. First: Refuses to answer. Mr. Cranston was informed that the design of the questions was to ascertain his relation to the Standards of the Church.

Mr. Smith asked through Dr. Middlemiss if Mr. Cranston was present just now on citation. When he replied, "Yes." On his being asked to state if there was reference in the citation to his holding doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Church, he replied that the citation did not specify any particular views. He affirmed that he was in harmony with the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. The nature of the conference and its design were explained to him, after which the first question was again read to him at his own request. When he answered, "Yes. He walks in the Spirit. While he abides in Christ there is no consciousness of sin." The question was repeated, and Mr. Cranston answered that he does not believe that any man in the past has been able throughout his life perfectly to keep the commandments of God. The question was repeated, and the reply was, "If he abides in Christ. He is always liable to break the commandments of God." The question repeated. Ans.—"He is liable to break them, but if he abides in Christ he will not break them."

By Mr. Cowan, through Dr. Middlemiss: "Have you ever lived without sin?" Ans.—"I cannot live one moment without sin of myself."

Q. Second: Ans.—"It depends on what you mean by sin." I am not delivered from sins of infirmity or weakness, but I am from actual transgressions while I abide in Christ." Question repeated. Ans.—"Believers are liable to the lusts of the flesh, and these will become sin if yielded to."

Mr. Cranston was repeatedly asked in the most kindly manner

to give direct answers to the questions, but did not do so. He was then informed that there was no use of putting to him any of the other questions, and he was excused from further attendance.

Miss Lizzie Morton was called, the questions were put to her, and her answers taken down as follows:—

Q. First: Ans.—“Yes, I do.”

Q. Second: Ans.—“I do.”

Q. Third: Ans.—“Not without the Spirit of God.” Question, “Do you believe that any man, except Christ, is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments? Ans.—“I do.”

Q. Fourth: Ans.—“Yes, I do.”

Q. Fifth: Ans.—“Yes, I do. I know it.”

Q. Sixth: Ans.—“Yes. I have on Sabbath afternoons, and on Tuesday and Friday evenings when cottage prayer meetings were going on.”

QUESTION.—“Have you been in the way of teaching in accordance with the views you have indicated?” Ans.—“Yes, in Sabbath School.

The questions and answers were read over to Miss Morton, when she stated that the answers were correctly recorded.

Mrs. Alex. Kay was called, and on the questions being put to her, answered as follows:—

Q. First: Ans.—“Yes.”

Q. Second: Ans.—“I believe that we can be delivered from sin, such things as hatred, envy, etc., as are mentioned towards the close of the fifth chapter of Galatians; but if you mean natural: appetites, passions, etc., we have always these things. I believe that there may be times when there is no sin in the believer.”

Q. Third: Ans.—“No, sir.” Do you believe that any man, with the exception of Christ, is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God? Answer—“Yes, for a day or a week, for a shorter or longer time.”

Q. Fourth: Ans.—“Yes.”

Q. Fifth: Ans.—“Yes.”

Q. Sixth: Ans.—“Yes, on Tuesday and Friday evenings at eight o'clock, holds meetings apart from those of the Church in the district and been sometimes at one and sometimes at the other.”

In reply to the question, “Have you been in the way of teaching in accordance with the views now indicated?” she replied, “Yes.”

The answer having been read over to Mrs. Kay, in connection with the questions, she declared that they were accurately recorded.

Mr. Alexander Cranston was called and replied as follows to the questions put to him:—

Q. First: Ans.—“God says in his word that his grace is suffi-

cient, and further, if ye love Me keep My commandments." Question repeated. Ans.—"I believe God's grace is sufficient."

Q. Second: An explanation of the question was asked and given as follows: "So delivers from the indwelling of sin that there is no sin in him for the time being." Ans.—"I do not understand the question."

Q. Third: Ans.—"God asks us to keep them. His grace is sufficient."

Fourth: Ans.—"While we walk in the Spirit I believe we do not commit sin." On the question being repeated. Ans.—"I believe that there are seasons, namely, 'when we walk in the Spirit and abide in him.'"

Q. Fifth: Ans.—"While we abide in him and walk in the Spirit, it is our privilege to dispense with the confession of sin and asking pardon for it."

Q. Sixth: "Are ordinary services meant?" An explanation was given, when Mr. Cranston replied, "Yes, occasionally."

The questions and replies were read over to Mr. Cranston, when he stated that the answers were correctly recorded.

Authenticated copy of the answers given by Messrs. J. K. Cranston and Alexander Cranston, to the questions put to them by the Session of Knox Church, Galt, 15th December, 1888.

To Mr. J. K. Cranston—

QUESTION. I.—I do believe that God gives grace in this life so that he can perfectly keep the commandments of God; and I do experience that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in me.

QUES. II.—I do.

QUES. III.—I do not. "Do you believe that any man, with the exception of Christ, is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God?" Ans.—Yes; I do believe that all that are born of God, and abide in Christ, can keep the commandments of God in this life. I am liable to make mistakes, and commit errors of judgment, but not wilful sins needing confession. I cannot have sin without being immediately conscious of it. I believe that the believer can keep the commandments of God perfectly in the sense of not being conscious of sin. I have been in such a state that I did not need to acknowledge sin before God.

QUES. IV.—I do.

QUES. V.—I do.

QUES. VI.—Yes, I have attended meetings in my own home on Tuesday and Sunday afternoons, and on Friday evenings in my mother's.

Mr. McCallum asked if Mr. Cranston was a teacher in the Sabbath School, and received the reply that he was. He further asked if while in the school he taught these doctrines to his class, and was answered that he did.

To a further question if it had been his custom to teach these doctrines as he had opportunity, Mr. Cranston answered that it had been.

Mr. Goodall asked Mr. Cranston if he had ever intercepted any parties going to district prayer meetings and endeavored to prevail upon them to go to his? When the reply was given that he had no recollection of having done so, that he had invited persons at different times to go with him, but had never asked them to leave their own meetings.

Mr. J. C. Smith asked Mr. Cranston if he was familiar with the exposition of Scripture contained in the Confession of Faith? And he replied that he had read all through very carefully. Asked if he had any idea that the answers now given involved any conflict between him and the Standards. When he replied that he thought his views are in substantial harmony with the Standards, but that there were some things in these Standards that he did not fully understand.

Dr. Vardon asked "From Mr. Cranston's own experience for how long a period at one time has he been able to live without having any sin to confess?" Ans.—"I have been in the position at times to dispense with the confession of sin."

The answers having been read over to Mr. Cranston, in connection with the questions, he declared that they had been correctly taken down.

Mr. Alexander Cranston called—

QUESTION I.—Ans.—Yes, I do. All things are possible to them that believe. When a believer fully abandons himself to the Lord, and allows him to have the right of way in every particular, the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in him because he walks not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

QUES. II.—I certainly do. When a man is made a new creature in Christ old things pass away and all things become new. Again, we are told to put off the old man which is corrupt, and to put on the new man.

QUES. III.—I do not, not without the indwelling power of the Holy Ghost.

QUES.—"Do you believe that any man, with the exception of Christ, is in this life able perfectly to keep the commandments of God?" "That any Christian man is thus able?" Yes, with the power of God in him.

By the Moderator, "Has Mr. Cranston, in his past life, been able to live without sin for any time—half an hour or an hour—for a longer or shorter time?" Yes, I have been kept by the power of the Holy Ghost.

QUES. IV.—Yes, I do. While we abide in Christ and are bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit we do not sin, and consequently there is no need of confession.

QUES. V.—Yes, I do. I believe that while we abide in Christ, and walk in the Spirit, it is our privilege to dispense with the confession of sin and asking pardon for it.

QUES. VI.—Yes, I have attended services.

Asked if he had been in the habit of teaching these views as opportunity offered? Mr. Cranston answered, Yes. At the meetings I attended I endeavoured to teach according to the light I had.

Professor Panton asked if Mr. Cranston regarded the views which he now professed as in harmony with the Standards of the Church. Have you examined the Standards of the Presbyterian Church and do you believe that these doctrines which you have now professed are in harmony with the Confession of Faith? Ans.—There is part of the Confession of Faith which I do not understand. I claim that these views are in harmony with the Word of God, according to the light I possess; and think they are in harmony with the Confession of Faith. Have not read the whole of the Confession, but have read different parts of it. Have read those parts bearing upon the views I have just stated.

The questions and answers having been read over to Mr. Cranston, he assented to the correctness of the latter.

At Galt, and within Knox Church, the eighth* day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Session of Knox Church met, according to appointment, and was constituted with prayer, Dr. Torrance leading therein, at the request of the Moderator. Present—Mr. Alexander Jackson, Moderator. Messrs. James Cowan, Thomas Rutherford, John W. Murray, Robert G. Struthers, Robert Gibson, Allan H. Goodall, George G. Nichol, with Drs. Wardrope, Middlemiss and Torrance, the Rev. J. C. Smith and J. B. Mullan, and Mr. Charles Davidson, and Prof. James Hoyes Panton, assessors by appointment of Presbytery.

Dr. Torrance was requested to act as clerk *pro tempore*.

The minutes of last meeting were read and sustained.

There was submitted and read a document in printed form, containing the minute of last meeting, which was compared with the minute in manuscript as read, and was found correct.

After deliberation the Session agreed to adopt the following as its report to the Presbytery at its meeting on Tuesday next, according to the instructions given it:—

The Session of Knox Church, Galt, have to

REPORT.

that, with the Assessors appointed by the Presbytery, all of whom, with the exception of Mr. Mullan, were present, they held a meeting in Knox Church, Galt, on the 27th day of November, and proceeded to the discharge of the duty to which they had been instructed to attend.

In carrying out these instructions those who had appeared before the

Presbytery as appellants in the case of protest and appeal had been summoned to appear before them, that they might be examined on the point of doctrine on which, it was alleged, they were not in harmony with the Standards of the Church; and to that citation they all answered.

A Committee of Session had been appointed to prepare a number of questions to be put to each one of them, all these questions bearing on the peculiar views which they were charged with holding and teaching, and based partly on the Lord's prayer, and upon certain parts of what are usually regarded as our Subordinate Standards, with one designed to ascertain if they had been following divisive courses in the congregation. These questions were as follows:—(See pages 19—26 of questions and answers.)

As one of the accused had been at one time an elder in the congregation, and had resigned on the ground that he was not in accord with the Standards, one question, in addition, was prepared for him, namely, No. VII.

Without considering the answers in detail, and which the members of Presbytery have in their hands in printed form, the Session have to report, generally, that these answers show that the accused hold the doctrine of perfect holiness in this life and that they have attained to it.

To the question, "Had they been teaching in accordance with the views stated in their answers?" all replied in the affirmative with the exception of Mr. Alexander Cranston, to whom the question was not put, and Mr. James K. Cranston, to whose case reference shall be made immediately.

To the question designed to elicit information as to their following divisive courses in the congregation, it was learned that they held meetings of their own, both central and district, of which the Session had no official knowledge, and that, in some instances, these did conflict with prayer meetings over which the Session had control.

Reference has been made to the case of Mr. James K. Cranston. He could not be prevailed upon to give frank and direct answers to the questions addressed to him; his conduct in this respect being in striking contrast to that of the rest, and especially to that of Mrs. Kay, Miss Morton and Mr. Caldwell, who gave their replies promptly and pertinently. The Session think they cannot do better than refer the Presbytery to the answers of Mr. Jas. K. Cranston, and it will see the reason they had for declining to proceed with his examination and for excusing him from further attendance.

The Session believe that the following POINTS ARE ESTABLISHED by the answers given and taken down at the time:—

I.—That the accused do hold the errors with which they are charged, and which, of course, are not in harmony with the Standards of the Church, and in proof of which they refer to the West. Conf. vi. 5, to the Larger Catechism, ques. 149, and to the

Shorter Catechism, ques. 82, also to the fifth petition of the Lord's prayer.

II.—That it has been their practice to hold their own meetings independently of those under sessional direction and authority, and that they have taught and do teach their peculiar views at these meetings, as well as elsewhere.

III.—That one of them, Miss Morton, had been teaching them in the Sabbath School to the class which she had under her charge.

Respectfully submitted by the Kirk Session of Knox Church
Galt.

ROBERT TORRANCE,

ALEXANDER JACKSON,

Clerk pro tem.

Moderator.

GALT, 8th December, 1888.

SUPPLEMENTED BY APPELLANT.

When Dr. Torrance had finished reading the documents, Mr. Jas. K. Cranston handed a paper to the Clerk, which he requested to have read.

Rev. Mr. Jackson and Dr. Torrance objected strongly to the paper being read.

Rev. Mr. Jackson urged that Mr. Cranston had no right to the floor. He said the Presbytery were asked to give a deliverance upon the reports of the Session before them only.

Mr. J. K. Cranston asked privilege to read the ruling of the General Assembly, in June, 1879, (See pages 16 and 18, Dodd's case) where the principle involved was the same.

That * * when the case is referred to a Judicial Committee, * * and when the parties in the cause do not acquiesce in the report of the Committee they have the right to be heard before the court disposes of the report.

The members of the Presbytery refused to hear Mr. Cranston. He then asked to be allowed to appeal to the Synod of Toronto and Kingston.

Rev. Mr. Jackson, Dr. Wardrope and Rev. J. C. Smith, stated that Mr. Cranston had nothing to appeal from, and that the appellant could appeal to the Synod after the decision and action of the Session of Knox Church, Galt.

A STATEMENT.

We, the undersigned, certify as follows:—That at the meeting of Presbytery held at Guelph, in Chalmers' Church, December 11th, called for the purpose of receiving and considering the report of Knox Church Session and Assessors, in reference to our views, that a full statement of our belief and views was laid on the table of Presbytery by James K. Cranston, together with the following letter:—

“TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

“DEAR FATHERS AND BRETHREN IN CHRIST—Permit us, respectfully,

to draw your attention to the enclosed document, which is, in as concise form as we can make it express our experience and views of the truth as it is in Jesus.

“Praying with all prayer in the Spirit that it may be a help to you in your efforts in the furtherance of the gospel of peace, by regulating according to the mind of God, the church visible.

“We remain yours in Christ.

“JAS. K. CRANSTON, and the six others.

“GALT, December 11th, 1888.”

For statement refused by Presbytery see page 5.

Our object in presenting the letter and statement to the Court was that we wished it clearly understood that all our answers and statements given at the various examinations, should in all fairness to us be interpreted in strict accordance with this our more thorough statement of belief.

The Presbytery refused to read our statement to the Court, or allow it to be read by us, and would not allow us to explain our position in any way, but proceeded to adopt the report.

At Guelph, and within Chalmer's Church, the eleventh day of December, one thousand, eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Presbytery of Guelph met, according to adjournment, and was constituted sederunt. Mr. Henry Edmison, M.A., Moderator, etc.

Inter alia. There was taken up and read the report of the Session of Knox Church, Galt, on the matter that had been referred to it at last meeting, and in which it had travelled, with the assistance of assessors then appointed; the report setting forth that the parties who had appeared before the Presbytery as appellants had been summoned to appear before the Session in answer to the charges of holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Church, and with following divisive courses in the congregation, that they had appeared, when questions were put to each of them bearing upon these doctrines and their answers, having been taken down, were read over to them and were assented to by them as correct, said questions and answers being stated in detail in connection with the report. The report closed with the statements that the Session does believe that the accused do hold erroneous views on the doctrine of the degree of personal holiness that may be attained in this life, and in proof that they are not in harmony with the Standards of the Church, it refers to the West. Conf. of Faith VI. 5; to the Larger Cat. Ques. 149; to the Shorter Cat. Ques. 82, and to the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer, and finds that it was their practice to hold their own meetings independently of those under Sessional direction and authority, and that they taught their peculiar views at these meetings and elsewhere, and that one of them, Miss Morton, had been teaching them to her class in the Sabbath School. After due deliberation upon the report it was moved by Mr. J. C. Smith, seconded by Dr. Wardrope, and resolved as follows:—

“Receive the report submitted, and whereas that report in the matter of William Henry, David Caldwell, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay, James K. Cranston and Alexander Cranston, charged by the Session of Knox Church, Galt, with holding and teach-

ing doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, and with pursuing a divisive course in respect to said Knox Church, set forth and establish three points: (1) That the answers given by the five persons first named above to the questions proposed by the Session with the view of finding out their attitude to the Standards of the Church clearly prove that the views held by them on the subject of personal sanctification in this life are directly opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures, as exhibited in the West. Conf. of Faith: chap. VI. 5; in the Larger Cat. Ques. 149, and in the Shorter Cat. Ques. 92. (2) That James K. Cranston and Alexander Cranston, when the same questions were put to them testing their conformity or non-conformity with the Standards, supreme and subordinate, refused to give any other than evasive and irrelevant answers, manifesting thereby a spirit of insubordination to Sessional authority. (3) That in disseminating their peculiar views and in some instances holding religious meetings which conflicted with Sessional appointments, the conduct of all the above-named persons has been for some time calculated seriously to disturb the harmony and hinder the well-being of the congregation concerned. Be it, therefore, resolved that the Presbytery instruct the Session of Knox Church, Galt, to deal with the accused in the respective premises, according to the rules of discipline applicable to such cases in the Presbyterian Church in Canada; that the Presbytery authorizes said Session to deal with James K. Cranston and Alexander Cranston on the ground of contumacy, and should this be persisted in to remove, in the interests of truth and righteousness, their names from the Communion Roll, declaring them to be no longer members of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and not to be restored to membership without leave granted by the Presbytery. Furthermore, that the Presbytery re-appoint the Assessors to co-operate with the Session in finally issuing the case.

On further motion it was resolved that Mr. J. A. R. Dickson be associated with the Session in further dealing with the aforesaid case.

Extracted from the records of the Presbytery of Guelph.

ROBERT TORRANCE,

Guelph, 14th December, 1888.

Pres. Clerk.

At Galt, and within Knox Church, the fifteenth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Session of Knox Church met, on the call of the Moderator, and was constituted with prayer sederunt. The Rev. Alexander Jackson, Moderator, etc.

On motion, it was agreed that Dr. Torrance be requested to act as clerk *pro tempore*.

The Moderator explained the object of the meeting and stated that the accused had been summoned to appear before the session at twelve o'clock to-day.

The instructions of Presbytery bearing on the case were read.

After careful deliberation, it was agreed that all the accused be brought into the presence of the Session in the first place; that they have explained to them the nature and end of the proceedings now to be taken, and instructed in the fact that the Session was dealing with them not in a judicial but in a paternal character, and that one

of the immediate objects contemplated was their own spiritual welfare.

It was further agreed that James K. Cranston and Alexander Cranston, who have taken the position of contumacious persons, be called in and enquiry made of them if they still adhered to their refusal to give plain and pertinent answers to the questions that had been prepared, and that in the event of their consenting to answer, the opportunity be given them of doing so, and that thereafter they shall be regarded as occupying the same standing with the others under accusation.

Further agreed that as on the former occasion the accused be called in and dealt with separately.

Dr. Middlemiss was appointed to conduct the dealings of the Session with the accused, under the direction of the Moderator.

James K. Cranston and Alexander Cranston were then called, had explained to them the nature and results of contumacy, and were asked if they still persisted in their course, or if they would show themselves obedient to the authority of the Session by answering the questions addressed to the others under accusation, when they stated that they were now willing to answer.

Alexander Cranston was then requested to retire, and the questions were put to Mr. James K. Cranston, his answers taken down, and on these being read over to him he declared that they were correctly recorded.

The Session now adjourned to meet in the same place at two o'clock in the afternoon, and the sederunt was closed with the benediction.

At two o'clock in the afternoon the Session met in the same place according to adjournment, and was constituted sederunt the same as in the forenoon.

Alexander Cranston was then called, the questions were put to him and his answers taken down, and he declared these, on their being read over to him, to be correct.

The charge of contumacy against him and James K. Cranston was then withdrawn, and it was agreed to rank them with the others charged with holding and teaching erroneous doctrines and following divisive courses in the congregation.

It was resolved that each one of the accused be now called in separately and in succession; that he have given to him the opportunity of saying whether he adhered to the answers he had returned to the questions at the former meeting of Session, and asked if there were any points on which he wished fuller light; that he be instructed as to the law of the Church on the points involved, and informed that he must conform to it or be cut off from the fellowship of the Church; and further that, he be requested to state if he is ready to cease from the propagation of his peculiar tenets; and that after this, on being removed from the presence of the Session, he be allowed to remain in the room.

Each of the accused was then called in and dealt with separately. Each of them declared that he adhered to the answers previously given, and that he would not cease to hold and teach them. Each of them had read to him those portions of the Standards of the Church with which his views were in conflict, and informed that he could not be allowed to teach them and be recognized as a member in full communion.

All the parties having been dealt with in this manner, the Session proceeded to deliberate, when it was moved by Dr. Wardropa, seconded by Dr. Middlemiss, and unanimously resolved :—

That the Session, having given long and careful consideration to the case of William Henry, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alex. Kay, James K. Cranston and Alex. Cranston, come to this

JUDGMENT :

I.—Their views in reference to entire sanctification in this life culminate in the assertion that they may rise, and that in some cases and for periods of longer or shorter duration, they have risen above the need of confessing sin and asking forgiveness ;

II. That these views are contrary to the Standards of the Church, and above all to the word of God, and are calculated seriously to injure the spiritual life of those by whom they are held, or to whom they are taught ;

III.—That had these brethren and sisters been prepared to desist from the propagation of these views, the Session, in their earnest desire to cherish a spirit of forbearance and love toward them, would have been willing even to leave them undisturbed in their church fellowship, in the hope that by the teaching of the Holy Spirit they would be lead into all the truth on the points under discussion ;

IV.—But that these brethren and sisters have declared and continue to declare that they would not only hold the views referred to, but teach them wherever an opportunity might be offered them ;

V.—The Session, therefore, realizing that in such a case they would themselves be responsible for the continuance of a teaching opposed to Scripture and subversive of the peace and unity of the Church, with heartfelt regret find themselves shut up to the necessity of suspending these brethren and sisters from the enjoyment of church privileges in connection with the congregation of Knox Church, until their views shall be brought into agreement with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church as founded on the Word of God ;

And they are hereby suspended accordingly.

Given in Session, this fifteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight.

ALEXANDER JACKSON,

GALT.

Moderator.

The accused having been called forward, the judgment about to be pronounced was explained to them in a most solemn and affectionate manner, and the judgment of the Session was read. From this judgment James K. Cranston dissented in the name of himself and all who may adhere to him, and protested for leave to complain to the Presbytery of Guelph, promising to give in reasons in due time, and took instruments in the Clerk's hands and craved extracts, which were allowed.

Mr. Jackson was instructed to read the judgment from the pulpit of Knox Church to-morrow after Divine service, for the information of the congregation, it being understood that special prayer should be offered up to God in view of all the circumstances.

Mr. Caldwell not having answered to the citation that had been served upon him, it was resolved that he be again cited to appear before the

Session at a meeting to be held on the twenty-ninth instant, in this place, at four o'clock in the afternoon.

The Session then engaged in solemn prayer, in which special reference was made to the action which had been taken in the case of the suspended, after which the proceedings were closed with the benediction.

Extracted from the record of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt.

Galt, Dec. 22nd, 1888.

ROBT. TORRANCE,

Clerk pro tem.

At Galt, and within Knox Church, the twenty-ninth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the Session of Knox Church met and was constituted sederunt. The Rev. Alexander Jackson, Moderator, etc.

On motion, it was agreed that Dr. Torrance be requested to act as clerk *pro tempore*.

The minutes of last meeting were read and sustained.

The Moderator reported that, according to instructions, he had read from the pulpit of Knox Church, on the sixteenth instant, immediately after divine service, the sentence of suspension from the fellowship of the Church decided upon by the Session at its last meeting against the six persons with whom they had dealings.

He also intimated that he had informed James K. Cranston and the others that in consequence of an unavoidable delay in furnishing them with an extract minute of Session in the case they would allowed eight days from the date of their receipt of said minute to prepare their reasons of protest and appeal.

He reported further that he had caused citation to be served upon David Caldwell to appear at the meeting of Session to-day, with notice that if he failed to do so he would be proceeded against as a contumacious person, as he had failed to appear under the former summons, and evidence was produced that the citation had been properly served.

Mr. Caldwell being present was called before the Session, and asked if he still adhered to the answers which he gave on the former occasion when he was before the Session, when he replied that he did.

Dr. Middlemiss, who had been appointed to the duty, then read to Mr. Caldwell those portions of the Standards (subordinate) with which his doctrinal views on the points under discussion were in conflict, and he having expressed his determination to adhere to them and to teach them to others, it was unanimously agreed to suspend him from the enjoyment of Church privileges in terms of the resolution adopted at the last meeting in reference to William Henry and others named therein, which resolution was read to him, and he was suspended accordingly.

The Session then engaged in solemn prayer, led by Dr. Wardrope, at the request of the Moderator.

Mr. Caldwell on being asked if he acquiesced in the decision replied that he did not, when, on being instructed as to his procedure in the circumstances, he entered his dissent, gave notice of protest and appeal, and promised that his reasons would be lodged in the hands of the clerk in due time.

The Moderator of Session, with Drs. Wardrope, Middlemiss and Torrance, and Mr. J. C. Smith, were appointed a committee to prepare answers to the reasons of protest and appeal by Mr. Caldwell and the others under sentence of suspension, when furnished with instructions to report.

Closed with prayer and the benediction.

ROBT. TORRANCE,
Clerk pro tempore.

The Manse, Knox Church, Dec. 17th, 1888.

Dear Mr. Cranston,

I am requested by the Session to explain to you that, in the first instance, your appeal from the Session should be taken to the Presbytery, and not to the Synod as you stated on Saturday to the Session.

The Session will accept your notice of appeal to Synod as being properly made to the Presbytery, and you can prepare your papers accordingly. That is, your papers should all be prepared for the Presbytery.

If you should not be satisfied with the decision of the Presbytery you can appeal against it to the Synod.

I am,

Your affectionate pastor,

ALEX. JACKSON.

THE PROTEST AND APPEAL OF WILLIAM HENRY, DAVID CALDWELL, JAMES K. CRANSTON, JOHN D. CRANSTON, ALEX. B. CRANSTON, LIZZIE MORTON, AND MRS. ALEXANDER KAY, against the action and decision of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, Ont.

To the GUELPH PRESBYTERY of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

Respectfully sheweth as follows:

1. That on or about the 23rd Nov., 1888, we were individually served with a paper, directed to each one of us respectively, and containing the words and figures following:

You are hereby required to appear before the Session of Knox Church, at a meeting to be held in the session room of the church, on the twenty-seventh (27th) day of November current, being next Tuesday, at the hour of two-and-a-half o'clock of the afternoon (2.30 p.m.), to answer to the charges of holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and of pursuing a divisive course in respect to said Knox Church, or either or both of them, made against you by the said Session.

Dated this twenty-third day of Nov., 1888.

(Signed),

JAMES COWAN,
Session Clerk.

GALT.

In answer to said request we appeared before the Session, and at the time and place named.

2. We were then separately called to appear before the court.

3. The Moderator explained to each one that the court had arranged a set of questions which would be propounded to us by Dr. Middlemiss, and informed us that the court would expect us to answer the questions, yes or no.

The following are the questions propounded :

(1.) Do you believe that in the case of any man such grace is given in this life that he can perfectly keep the commandments of God, but does not daily break them in thought, word, or deed ?

(2.) Do you believe that, in any case, the believer is, in this life, delivered from the inbeing of sin ?

(3.) Do you believe that any mere man is, in this life, perfectly able to keep the commandments of God ?

(4.) Do you believe there are any seasons in the experience of the believer when he does not need to confess sin ?

(5.) Do you believe that there are any seasons in the earthly experience of the Christian when he can dispense with the confession of sin, and asking pardon for it ?

(6.) Have you held or attended service carried on simultaneously with the services held under the direction of the Session of this Church ?

(7.) To John D. Cranston.—Have you changed your doctrinal views since you resigned the office of the eldership ?

4. James K. Cranston, and Alex. B. Cranston at first objected to answer the questions propounded, and requested the court to inform them of the particular views they were accused of holding and teaching which were not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

They claimed that the citation was irregular, in that it did not fulfil the requirements of Rules and Forms, clause 269, and Form II., page 63, R.F., for Heresy.

This reasonable request for information was refused. The Moderator stating that they were expected to answer the questions yes or no, without further explanations.

5. In answering the questions propounded, we endeavored to explain our belief and views by giving scriptural quotations. But while doing so, some members of the court protested against our being allowed this privilege, and were successful in preventing our views on any one point being fully heard.

In our opinion the court, in the endeavor to confine us to yes and no answers, did not obtain sufficient information to warrant them in sending to the Presbytery the report which they did.

Consequently we did not at this, as at the former meeting, have the opportunity of explaining ourselves in anything like a satisfactory manner.

6. It is true that questions may be framed that yes and no answers to them may seem to be at variance with some parts of

the Church Standards of any Church, or even with isolated passages of the Bible.

The compilers of the creed of our Church said themselves that in all controversies of religion the Church is to appeal to the Scriptures, and that Scripture must be compared with Scripture to secure its full meaning (see clauses 8-10, Con. Faith).

7. We therefore appeal to the Scriptures, and claim that we have been unjustly dealt with by the said Session, inasmuch as we were not permitted to give them a full statement of our position, belief and views, or to substantiate the same by Scripture proofs.

8. For the reasons above alluded to, amongst others, we beg respectfully to appeal against the action and decision of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt.

We ask that the Presbytery give careful and prayerful consideration to the following reasons of protest and appeal:

1. Your appellants claim that they have been guilty of no offence rendering them liable to discipline in the Presbyterian Church of Canada, as defined in articles 240 and 243 of rules (Rules and Forms). And never, to their knowledge, have been proven guilty of any such offence.

2. That no "fama" exists against any one of us which endangers the honor of religion, or is condemned by Scripture or by the established regulations and practices of the Church founded on Scripture.

3. We protest and appeal, because we were received into the membership of the Presbyterian Church on profession of our faith in Christ and obedience to Him (see clause 199, Rules and Forms). We claim that in accordance with the above rule that we cannot (nor can any other member of the Presbyterian Church of Canada) be disciplined for their faith in and obedience to Christ—faith in and obedience to Christ being the main imputations made against us by the Session (see questions, pages 19-26). We protest that the said action and decision could not have had for its object "the glory of God," "the purity of the Church," or the spiritual good of the appellants (see clauses 240 and 243, R. F). Faith in and obedience to Christ, as we understand them, not only glorify God, but purify the Church and the individual.

4. Your appellants protest, because the Session reported to the Presbytery that the answers to the questions asked "show that the accused hold and teach the doctrine of perfect holiness in this life, and that they have attained to it." If, by "perfect holiness," the Session meant to imply that we believe we have attained to absolute perfection, they have wrongfully judged us; or if they meant that we think that we have arrived at a state which precludes further growth in grace or knowledge of divine things, we reiterate they have wrongfully judged us.

5. The Session report that they find us to be out of harmony

with chap. 6, clause 5, of "The Confession of Faith," which reads:—"The corruption of nature during this life doth remain in those that are regenerated, and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin."

We admitted that we had difficulty in harmonizing this clause with certain other clauses of "The Confession of Faith" and the Word of God, such as clauses 1 and 3, of evidences of true faith, 3rd and 4th requisites.

Faith unfeigned is able to make the conscience good, and the heart pure, and the man lovingly obedient to the law, etc., etc.

Chap. xx., clause 3:—They who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, do practise any sin or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty, which is being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Chap. iii., clause 6, reads:—We are redeemed, justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by the power of God.

May not this clause (chap. vi., clause 5,) describe the condition of those Christians who, having begun in the Spirit, are trying to be made perfect by the flesh, as did the Galatians (see 3rd chapter, 1st to 3rd verses), or the condition of those Christians such as Paul wrote to (see 1st Cor., 3rd chapter, 1st to 4th verses), or the Hebrew Christians who had not entered into the Christian's rest because of unbelief (see Heb. chapters iii. and iv.) Surely it cannot describe the condition of the Christian filled with and walking in the Spirit.

6. If this be not the correct interpretation, we cannot understand how said clause can be harmonized with other clauses of the Confession of Faith and the Scripture passages on which they are based. (See clause 6, chap. iii.; chap. xiii., clause 1; chap. xx., clauses 1-3; of "Evidence of True Faith," third requisite, clauses 1-4).

7. Your appellants claim that they are not out of harmony with either question No. 149 or No. 82 in the Larger and Shorter Catechism, as judged by the Session. We believe that when it is said that no mere man can keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed, they mean no man not born of God—Rom. iii. 10-19, being quoted as a basis of the statement. In proof that our view is correct, we call attention to the fact that the same passages are quoted in support of chap. vi., clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, which describe man in his natural condition.

8. We protest that the Session's judgment in finding us out of harmony with the fifth petition of our Lord's Prayer was without foundation. We believe that this prayer may at all times be prayed by the child of God, who is having fulfilled in his life—the third petition of the Lord's Prayer, viz: "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven."

9. Again, the children of God are daily indebted to their Heavenly Father for the gift of His Son in redeeming us, and for daily grace, preservation and blessing. Consequently, we owe a debt of gratitude which we shall never be able to pay. Therefore we can daily pray, "Forgive us our debts," etc., etc.

10. We have wittingly held no rival meetings, and have not advised people to leave their own church or its services.

11. With regard to the statement made by the Session in their report to the Presbytery—"That John D. Cranston had resigned his office of the eldership on the ground that he was not in accord with the Standards," he has to say that he did not express himself antagonistic to the Standards, but had some difficulty in reconciling certain lines of teaching one with the other, as given in the Confession of Faith. The construction put on this by the Moderator was that he was out of harmony, and to which he replied, in effect, that "as you are seemingly determined (because of my difficulties in harmonizing certain clauses of the Confession of Faith) to interpret my attitude as being out of harmony with the Standards," he would resign the office of the eldership.

Permit us to call your attention to the following statement of our experience and views of the truth as it is in Jesus, as given in the statement in appeal to Assembly.

At Galt, and within Knox Church, the twelfth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, the Session of Knox Church met, according to adjournment, and was constituted with prayer. Present the Rev. Alexander Jackson, Moderator, Messrs. John W. Murray, etc.

Inter alia, the Session proceeded to consider the case of William Henry and others, suspended on account of holding and teaching doctrine not in accordance with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church and of pursuing a divisive course in respect to said Knox Church.

The minutes of the meeting of December 29, 1888, were read and approved.

The protest and appeal of William Henry and others against the judgment of Session was presented by the Moderator, and a draft report and answer to the appeal to be submitted to Presbytery were also submitted by the Moderator. After deliberation the Session agreed to adopt the following as its report to the Presbytery, and its answer to the reasons for protest and appeal submitted by William Henry and other appellants, and authorizes the clerk to forward the same to Presbytery to be presented at its meeting on next Tuesday.

The Session of Knox Church, Galt, have to

REPORT

That, with the Assessors appointed by Presbytery, all of whom, with the exception of Mr. Mullan, were present, they held a meeting in

Knox Church, Galt, on the 15th day of December, and proceeded to the discharge of the duty with which Presbytery had entrusted them, and which was interrupted to report to Presbytery and receive further instructions in the case.

The instructions of Presbytery bearing on the case were read.

The said James K. and Alexander Cranston were interrogated and gave answers which showed that they were in full accord with the others whose answers had been reported to Presbytery.

Thereafter the Session dealt with each of the six persons who had appeared, . . . pointing out the sections of the Standards with which they were not in accord, . . . and they were suspended in terms of the following judgment of Session :—(See judgment of Session, pages 47, 48).

James K. Cranston gave notice of protest and appeal, and each of the others for himself and herself assented thereto, and they were instructed by the Moderator as to the necessary course to have their protest and appeal presented before and considered by the Presbytery.

At a subsequent meeting, at which Drs. Torrance, Wardrope and Middlemiss and the Rev. J. C. Smith, B.D., of the Assessors appointed by Presbytery were present, held in Knox Church, Galt, on the 29th day of December, David Caldwell, who had been cited under the direction of the Moderator, . . . was suspended in the same terms as the others.

On the eighth day of the present month, January, the protest and appeal of the suspended members, with their reasons annexed, was placed in the hands of the Moderator of Session.

The Session have waded through it with the utmost care, and in answer would say :—

In so far as the appeal bears on the merits of the main question, the Session beg to call the attention of members of Presbytery to the arguments of the appellants, which fully substantiate the judgment of the Session that the appellants are out of accord with the Standards, and especially with God's Word, and they persist in disseminating their wrong views :

a. In sec. 5, page 37, of their appeal, the appellants say, "We admitted that we had difficulty in harmonizing this clause (chap. VI. sec. 5, Confession of Faith) with certain other clauses of the Confession of Faith and the Word of God; and then, after a most original comment on this clause of the Confession, they further say, "Surely it cannot describe the condition of the Christian *filled with and walking in the Spirit.*" The italics are in the appeal. And they add, "If this be not correct, we

cannot understand how the said clauses can be harmonized with clauses III : 6 ; XIII : 1 ; XX : 1 and 3, etc., etc.

b. In sec. 6, page 37, the appellants give a most original interpretation of the words "No mere man" of the 82nd question of the Shorter Catechism. They say, "we believe . . . that they mean no man not born of God." As is known to all intelligent people, the phrase was used to exclude the Christ, as the only man who ever lived on this earth in perfect sinlessness, and in quest. 149 of the Larger Catechism, which the appellants ignore, although it was read and re-read to them, and explained, the statement of the Presbyterian doctrine is made much more explicit : "No man is able, either of himself, or by any grace received in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God ; but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed."

c. The attention of Presbytery is called to the unique reason given by the appellants (8, p. 37) for *their* use of the Lord's prayer, consistent with their peculiar views, that they as Christians have no daily sin to confess and ask forgiveness for. Here it is : "Again the children of God are daily indebted to their Heavenly Father for the gift of His Son in redeeming them. Consequently we owe a debt of gratitude which we shall never be able to repay. Therefore we can daily pray to forgive us our debts, etc., etc."

d. The appellants also admit (7, p. 8), that they believe they do not sin.

The Presbytery will find abundance in these paragraphs to sustain the judgment of the Session.

The appellants appear to be grossly ignorant of some of the plainest doctrines of Scripture. They appear to be totally ignorant of the essential nature of sin, of the atonement which Christ has effected for His people, and of the application of it to believers by the Holy Spirit. And while the Session would have been pleased to instruct them, or let them alone if they had remained quiet, as they have done with many others at different times in the hope that the Holy Spirit would use His preached Word to lead them into the truth on these subjects, the appellants would not be taught.

The Session would also convey to the Presbytery their grateful appreciation of the efficient assistance of the assessors appointed by Presbytery (Drs. Wardrope, Torrence, and Middlemiss, and Revs. J. C. Smith, B.D., J. A. R. Dickson, B.D., and Elders Charles Davidson and Prof. Jas. Noyes Pantou), who have rendered valuable services to Knox Church and the cause of truth.

The Session hereby respectfully ask the Presbytery to dismiss the appeal of William Henry and others, and in such a form as will help to convince the appellants that the Presbytery will not allow the Church to be injured or the cause of truth to be imperilled.

Respectfully submitted by the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, this twelfth day of January, in the year of our Lord, one thousand, eight hundred and eighty-nine.

JAS. W. MURRAY,
Clerk pro tempore.

ALEXANDER JACKSON,
Moderator.

The asterisks imply that that portion of the records which is made up of charges against the moral character of the appellants is left out, as these charges were virtually withdrawn before the Synod at Bowmanville. The following letter, which was published in the *News* immediately after, will more fully explain the matter :—

“THE GALT HERESY CASE.

“EDITOR *NEWS*.—In justice to ourselves we feel it right to add a few sentences to the report of the so-called Galt heresy case, which came before the Synod recently held at Bowmanville. It was gratifying to us to see that there was a strong desire to censure the unseemly personalities compromising to our moral character, which were brought into the previous trials by our prosecutors. In deference to this feeling Rev. Mr. Jackson, the principal author of these accusations, expressed a desire to have them all expunged from the records, admitting that he had made certain allegations largely through being misinformed and lack of information.

“It is to be regretted that this admission was not accompanied with suitable apology. Let us hope that the time will come in the near future when ministers of the gospel will be an example to their flocks, not only in part, but fully in the matter of undoing wrong when committed.

“We further remark in this connection, that as his now acknowledged injury was done publicly, it would have been only in harmony with righteousness that he or his friends should have had this acknowledgment made public, and not have left it to us.

“We gratefully acknowledge the general Christian courtesy and fairness of the members of the Synod at the late investigation, and if a satisfactory result has not been reached, we admit that it is from no lack of time and painstaking on their part. The doctrinal questions seemed at length to simmer down to one, and that concerning inbred sin, or the indwelling of sin in believers. Now, as this puzzling question had not seemed to us of such vital importance as the Synod made it, and as we have not intentionally made it prominent in our experience or teaching, we do not regard our replies as final, and therefore do not dismiss all hope of coming to a satisfactory understanding concerning this admittedly difficult subject. Indeed, we expressed ourselves at the trial as open to conviction, and as only holding our expressed views till fully persuaded concerning others as better.

“To this question, which was asked in the following form : ‘Has the tendency to sin been taken away, and is this tendency not of the nature of evil, and therefore in itself sin?’ our reply was : ‘If you claim that the tendency to shrink from the law of obedience, especially under testing and trying circumstances, is sin, and if that be your interpretation of indwelling sin, we reply, in that sense, we have never, and do not claim to be free from sin.’

“This answer was not accepted as being sufficiently definite, and so the matter rested.

“Our appeal to the General Assembly was taken in no factious spirit, either as striving to gain some personal triumph, or as undertaking the Quixotic notion of changing the doctrines of the Presbyterian

Church, but from the sense of being still misunderstood, and with the belief that ultimately we will not be found, either voluntarily or by the ruling of others, to sever our connection with it.

“J. D. AND J. K. CRANSTON.

“Galt, May 17.”

At Galt, and within Knox Church, the fifteenth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, the Presbytery of Guelph met, according to appointment, and was constituted sederunt. Mr. Henry Edmison, M.A., Moderator, etc.

Inter alia the Presbytery proceeded to take up a protest and appeal by William Henry and others against the action of the Session of Knox Church, Galt, in suspending them from the fellowship of the Presbyterian Church. All of the papers in the case containing reasons of protest and appeal were read. Answers to these reasons by the Session of Knox Church, with other documents were read, each of the appellants was heard in support of the reasons. Mr. Jackson, Moderator, and Mr. McCallum, were heard from the Session. Opportunity was given to the appellants to reply. Parties were then removed and the Presbytery proceeded to deliberate. It was moved by Mr. James C. Smith, B.D., seconded by Mr. James A. R. Dickson, B.D., and unanimously resolved, “That the Presbytery having heard the protest and appeal with reasons, and the answers to the same with the other papers produced, sustains the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, and dismisses the appeal.” Parties having been recalled, the judgment was announced to them when the Session declared their acquiescence in the same, while Mr. James K. Cranston dissented in his own name, as each of the other appellants did in his or her name, and protested for leave to complain to the Synod of Toronto and Kingston, appointed to meet in Bowmanville on the 14th day of May next, promising to give in reasons in due time, and craved extracts which were allowed.

Extracted from the records of the Presbytery of Guelph.

ROBERT TORRANCE,

GUELPH, 24th, April 1889.

Pres. Clerk.

At Elora, and within Knox Church, the twenty-first day of February, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, the Presbytery of Guelph met, according to appointment, and was constituted sederunt. Mr. James B. Mullan, Moderator *pro tempore*, etc.

Inter alia there were laid upon the table reasons of protest by William Henry and others against the judgment of this Presbytery of date fifteenth of January last, dismissing the protest and appeal against the judgment of the Kirk Session of Knox Church,

Galt, in suspending them from the membership of the Church on the grounds of alleged doctrinal error, and following divisive courses in the congregation, and appeal to the Synod of Toronto and Kingston of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

On motion it was agreed that a Committee consisting of Dr. Torrance, Convener, Dr. Middlemiss, Mr. J. C. Smith and Mr. D. Tait, Ministers, with Mr. Charles Davidson, Ruling Elder, be appointed to prepare answers to the same, and submit them to Presbytery at its next ordinary meeting.

Extracted from the records of the Presbytery of Guelph.

ROBERT TORRANCE,

Pres. Clerk.

GUELPH, 24th April, 1889.

THE APPEAL OF WILLIAM HENRY, DAVID CALDWELL, JAMES CRANSTON, JOHN D. CRANSTON, ALEX. B. CRANSTON, LIZZIE MORTON AND MRS. ALEX. KAY,

To the SYNOD OF TORONTO AND KINGSTON, of the Presbyterian Church of Canada,

Showeth as follows:

That the Presbytery of Guelph dismissed their appeal against the finding of Knox Church Session, Galt, Ont., after having at a former meeting given a deliverance, which virtually pronounced them guilty. See judgment of Presbytery, December 11, 1888, appended on page 47, to be read if necessary.

1. Therefore we maintain that no Court, civil or religious, has the right in equity to adjudicate in an appeal case on which they had given a deliverance.

2. Being conscious that we do not hold the doctrines imputed to us by the verdicts rendered in our case, we desire that the Synod would, in the interests of justice to us as individual members of the Church, and the cause of Christianity, examine more minutely into charges made against us.

3. We do not believe in or teach absolute perfection.

4. We do not teach sanctification, heart purity, or Christian perfection as a second blessing.

5. But we do emphasize the receiving of the gift of the Holy Ghost in a pentecostal sense, as the privilege of all believers, and maintain that all the graces of the Spirit flow in due form from their fountain head: if we continue to walk in the Spirit. Moreover, we do not dogmatize as to the time of the reception of this experience, whether at conversion or any time subsequent thereto. We simply emphasize it as the privilege of all believers who are conscious of their lack. Moreover, we have prayerfully compared the teachings of our standards with those of the Bible, and believe that they do with the Apostle John, teach us that being born of God and abiding in Christ we sin not, and with St. Paul, that the righteousness of the law is being fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. These and kindred Bible utterances are to us a glad Christian experience. These facts being known to our consciousness as realities, we cannot but indulge the hope that your assembled piety and experience will enable you to secure for us the continuance of the Church privileges and ordinances which have heretofore been a blessing to us. The deprivation of said privileges are to us a matter of deep regret.

6. With reference to other points raised during the progress of the trial, such as the inbeing of sin, the difference between the

positive and superlative degree in connection with such terms as love, obedience, etc., etc, we do not profess to have discovered, or to hold, any rigid creed or doctrine. In fact, we do not profess to be perfect in our understanding of them, and are therefore open to instruction concerning them. All we contend for is the fact that it is our privilege as taught in the Scriptures and not gainsayed in the Standards, to accept as believers the Holy Ghost, the same as did the early Christians, and walk in Him as our joy, empowerer and guide, into all truth, etc. This we now know as a blessed experience, and as the results are to us most blessed and satisfactory, we cannot refrain from telling to all willing ones our joy in the Lord, and the simple way of glad acceptance. And so we put ourselves in your hands willing to abide by any decision in the interests of peace and harmony, and the prosperity of the Church, provided it does not rob us of our joy in God through the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us and the privilege to tell to others the glad news of Gospel truth.

And finally, whilst directing attention to accompanying documents, we ask you to interpret them in accordance with these sentiments.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

As witness our hands this 23rd day of January, 1889,

WILLIAM HENRY,
DAVID CALDWELL,
JAMES K. CRANSTON,
JOHN D. CRANSTON,
ALEX. B. CRANSTON,
LIZZIE MORTON,
MRS. ALEX. KAY.

The following is the judgment of the Presbytery of Guelph as given December 11, 1888, in the Chalmers' Church, Guelph, Ont.

A UNANIMOUS RESOLUTION.

Rev. J. C. Smith, before moving his resolution, referred to the findings of the Session and Assessors. He then moved the following preamble and resolution:—

Received the report now submitted; and whereas that report in the matter of William Henry, David Caldwell, John D. Cranston, Lizzie Morton, Mrs. Alexander Kay, James C. Cranston, and Alexander B. Cranston, charged by the Session of Knox Church, Galt, with holding and teaching doctrines not in accordance with the standards of the Presbyterian Church, and with pursuing a a divisive course in respect to the said Knox Church, sets forth and establishes three points:

(1.) That the answers given by the five persons first named above to the questions proposed by the Session with the view of finding out their attitude to the standards of the Church, clearly prove that the views held by them on the subject of personal

sanctification in this life are directly opposed to the teachings of the Scriptures as exhibited in the Westminster Confession of Faith (p. 6, sec. 5); in the Church Catechism, question 149, and in the Shorter Catechism, question 82.

(2.) That James K. Cranston and Alexander B. Cranston, when the same questions were put to them by the Session testing their conformity or non-conformity with the standards supreme and subordinate, refused to give any other than evasive and irrelevant answers, manifesting thereby a spirit of insubordination to sessional authority.

(3.) That in disseminating their peculiar views, and in some instances holding religious meetings which conflicted with sessional appointments, the conduct of all the above named persons has been for some time calculated seriously to disturb the harmony and hinder the well being of the congregation concerned.

Be it therefore resolved, that the Presbytery instruct the Session of Knox Church, Galt, to deal with the accused in the respective premises according to the rules and discipline applicable to such cases in the Presbyterian Church in Canada; that the Presbytery authorize the said Session to deal with James K. Cranston and Alexander B. Cranston, on the grounds of contumacy; and, in the event of this being persisted in, to remove, in the interests of truth and righteousness, their names from the communion roll, declaring them to be no longer members of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and not to be restored to membership without leave granted by the Presbytery; and furthermore that the Presbytery re-appoint the assessors to co-operate with the Session in finally issuing the case.

Rev. Dr. Wardrope, in seconding the resolution, said he believed all the parties concerned in the matter, the accused, the members of Knox Church, the Session, and the Presbytery, were at one to know more fully the will of God and to be brought more into conformity therewith. They also recognized the prevalence of the inquiry into this question of Scriptural holiness, and the earnest attention that had been awakened in regard thereto. He believed this earnest inquiry had stimulated all Christians to a fuller and larger communion with God. They all admitted that there were depths of fellowship and heights of joy in Christian life which they had never reached.

At Guelph, and within Chalmers' Church, the nineteenth day of March, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, the Presbytery of Guelph met, according to appointment, and was constituted sederunt, Mr. Henry Edmison, M.A., Moderator, etc.

Inter alia the Committee appointed for the purpose submitted answers to the reasons of protest and appeal by William Henry and others against the judgment of the Presbytery in sustaining

the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in dismissing their appeal from the same for suspending them from church fellowship, on the alleged ground of doctrinal error and following divisive courses in the congregation. The reasons of protest and appeal were read *seriatim* with the proposed answer to each. It was then resolved that the answers just read be approved; that they be adopted by the Presbytery as its answers to the reasons that have been lodged, and that the same Committee * that prepared them be appointed to support them before the Synod, when the case shall come up for consideration.

Extracted from the records of the Presbytery of Guelph.

ROBERT TORRANCE,

Pres. Clerk.

Guelph, 24th April, 1889.

* The Committee are Drs. Torrance and Middlemiss, Mr. J. C. Smith, D. Tait and Charles Davidson.

Answers by the PRESBYTERY OF GUELPH to the reasons of protest and appeal by William Henry and others against the judgment of said Presbytery sustaining the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, on suspending them from the fellowship of the Church.

The Presbytery believe that the best way of answering the first reason of protest and appeal is to give a narrative of the facts in the case.

On the 18th September, 1888, a protest and appeal by William Henry and six others—the same that are the appellants in the present action was laid before the Presbytery against the action of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in removing their names from the Communion Roll of that congregation, with the prayer that the action of the Session be annulled and that it be directed to re-enter their names on the Roll, and reinstate them in all the rights and privileges previously enjoyed. After hearing all parties it was decided that further consideration of the case be postponed till next regular meeting, and that the protest and appeal lie on the table in the meantime.

At the next regular meeting, on the 20th November, the protest and appeal was again taken up and considered. After deliberation the following finding was adopted: "The Presbytery having heard the protest and appeal, and also the statement of the Session in reply, regrets that it is not yet in possession of the necessary data for coming to a right decision in the case, and in order to receive all the necessary information regarding the views of the appellants, and, also, to give them the full benefit of what they consider the law of the Church, the Presbytery appoint the following brethren to act as assessors with the Session; to go, if thought necessary, over the whole ground again, and to report to a meeting of Presbytery held three weeks from to-day in this place, the Rev. Drs. Wardrope, Torrance and Middlemiss, Messrs. James C. Smith, and J.B. Mullan, with Mr. Charles Davidson and Professor Pantou.

At the end of the appointed time, namely, on the 11th December, the Presbytery met and the Session of Knox Church presented the following

report which narrates the steps taken in carrying out their instructions, and the conclusion at which they had arrived.

The session of Knox Church, Galt, have to report that with the assessors appointed by the Presbytery, all of whom, with the exception of Mr. Mullan, were present, they held a meeting in Knox Church, Galt, on the 27th of November, and proceeded to the discharge of the duty to which they had been instructed to attend.

In carrying out these instructions those who had appeared before the Presbytery as appellants in the case of protest and appeal had been summoned to appear before them, that they might be examined upon the points of doctrine on which, it was alleged, they were not in harmony with the Standards of the Church, and to that citation they all answered.

A Committee of Session had been appointed to prepare a number of questions to be put to each one of them, all these questions bearing on the peculiar views which they were charged with holding and teaching, and based partly on the Lord's Prayer, and upon certain parts of what are usually regarded as our Subordinate Standards, with one designed to ascertain if they had been following divisive courses in the congregation. These question were as follows, (I need not transcribe these as you have them already.)

As one of the accused had been at one time an Elder in the congregation and had resigned on the ground that he was not in accord with the Standards, one question in addition was prepared for him, namely No. VIII.

Without considering the answers in detail, and which the members of Presbytery have in their hands in printed form, the Session have to report generally, that these answers show the accused hold the doctrine of perfect holiness in this life, and that they have attained to it.

To the question, "Had they been teaching in accordance with the views stated in their answers," they all replied in the affirmative, with the exception of Mr. Alexander Cranston, to whom the question was not put, and J. K. Cranston, to whose case reference shall be made immediately.

To the question designed to elicit information as to their following divisive courses in the congregation it was learned that they held meetings of their own, both central and district, of which the Session had no official knowledge, and that, in some instances, these did conflict with prayer meetings over which the Session had control.

Reference has been made to the case of Mr. J. K. Cranston. He could not be prevailed upon to give frank and direct answers to the questions addressed to him, his conduct in this respect being in striking contrast to that of the rest, and especially to that of Mrs. Kay, Miss Morton and Mr. Caldwell, who gave their replies pertinently and promptly. The Session think they cannot do better than refer the Presbytery to his answers, and it will see the reason they had for declining to proceed with his examination, and for excusing him from further attendance.

The Session believe that the following points have been established by the answers given and taken down at the time.

I.—That the accused do hold the errors with which they are charged, and which of course are not in harmony with the Standards of the Church, and in proof of which they refer to the West. Conf. VI. 5, to the Larger

Catechism, ques. 149, and to the Shorter Catechism, ques. 82. Also to the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer.

II.—That it has been their practice to hold their own meetings independently of those under Sessional direction and authority, and that they have taught, and do teach, their peculiar views at these meetings as well as elsewhere.

III.—That one of them, Miss Morton, had been teaching them in the Sabbath School to the class she had under her charge.

Respectfully submitted by the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt.

ALEX. JACKSON,
Moderator.

GALT, 8th December, 1888.

On this report the Presbytery came to the following decision :

From this decision it will appear that the Presbytery was fully seized of the case, that they had sufficient evidence before them to satisfy themselves that the parties were guilty of holding views not in harmony with the Standards of our Church, and had been following divisive courses in the congregation, and then adopted the proper course in the circumstances by instructing the Session to deal with the accused in the respective premises according to the rules of discipline applicable to such cases in the Presbyterian Church.

It was at this meeting then that the Presbytery pronounced the parties guilty as charged, thus passing judgment upon them, and directing the Session to deal with them accordingly.

In proceeding to execute the judgment of the Presbytery the Session summoned the parties to appear before them, asked them if they still adhered to their former views, and if they considered themselves bound in conscience to teach them, and being answered in the affirmative by each one, the Session in a prayerful spirit, and in solemn manner, suspended them from the fellowship of the Church. Each of them gave notice of appeal with reasons, to which answers by the Session were prepared. All the documents were laid before the Presbytery at its meeting in January ; and all the appellants were heard in support of their reasons. The Session was heard in support of its answer. After full inquiry and consideration it was unanimously resolved that the conduct of the Session in carrying out the instructions of the Presbytery be approved, and that the appeal taken be dismissed. It is against this decision that the present appeal is brought.

From this narrative it will be seen that the Presbytery had not only virtually, but actually, pronounced the parties guilty on sufficient evidence—the Session had no other course before them, in virtue of their instructions, than the one pursued, unless that the accused had declared that they had changed their views, having seen the error of their ways, and the Presbytery could not do other than what they did.

II.—The Presbytery has no objection to the request contained in the second reason, and they will be pleased, in the event of such an inquiry being held, it should turn out that the appellants are now sound in the faith.

But it cannot be meant that any *new* inquiry that may be instituted and *new* information that may be acquired can affect the decision to which the Presbytery has come which was founded on answers given by the

parties themselves to the questions proposed to them—these answers being taken down at the time, read over to each of them at the close of his examination, and assented to as being a correct record of his replies and statement of his views on the points specified. The question simply is, “Were the questions proper?” And no exception has been taken to them. Were the answers correctly recorded? And not one has said that they were not. Was the finding of the Session and of the Presbytery supported by these answers?

III.—To this reason the answer of the Presbytery is that the appellants have not been charged with believing or teaching “absolute perfection,” and the Presbytery do not understand why this article has been introduced as a reason of protest.

IV.—Neither have they been charged with holding the doctrine negatively repudiated in Reason No. 4.

V.—Answer to No. 5: While not disposed to be hypercritical the Presbytery does not suppose that when the appellants say “But we do emphasize the receiving of the gift of the Holy Ghost in a Pentecostal sense as the privilege of all believers” they wish to be understood as believing that the Holy Ghost is poured out upon all believers in the manner, form, degree and for, in all respects, the same purpose, that He was in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Facts are against them.

The Presbytery assents to the statement of the middle clause, and maintain that “all the graces of the Spirit flow in due form from this their fountain head” if the meaning is that the Holy Ghost is the fountain head of the graces of the Spirit—or perhaps better to say “the applying agent,” while Jesus Christ, according to the constitution of the economy of redemption, is the fountain head of all grace.

Does the last clause mean that the flowing in due form of the graces of the Spirit is conditional upon the believers walking in the Spirit? Is not the “flowing” prior to and causative of the walking?

The Presbytery has to express its disappointment that the appellants have not explained what they mean by receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost in a “Pentecostal sense.” Do they mean, as might be inferred, that by this gift, and from the time of it, believers are made perfectly holy if they continue to walk in the Spirit?

All Presbyterians hold the doctrines stated in the last section of the reason. They are the doctrines of God’s Word and of the Standards of our Church which are founded on that Word. But the appellants do not hold them in the sense in which we understand them. Nor do they themselves hold as a matter of experience “that they sin not,” for in their answers to the questions put to them they admit that there are only times, and these but short seasons, when they are without sin, and cannot use the petition in the Lord’s Prayer forgive us our debts in the sense in which it is commonly understood. The Presbytery holds that they are wrong in their exegesis of the passages quoted, and that their experience shows them to be wrong, notwithstanding their assertion to the contrary.

VI.—To the sixth reason the Presbytery reply as follows:—It is to be regretted that the appellants have not discovered any rigid creed or doctrine on two of the points stated by them as raised during the progress of the trial:—1st, As to the inbeing of sin, God’s Word is explicit

on the subject ; so is that clause in Chap. VI. of the Confession of Faith, which was read deliberately and solemnly to each one of them when under trial. 2nd, As to the difference between the positive and superlative degree in connection with such terms as love, obedience, etc., the Presbytery wishes that the appellants had been precise and explicit as to the manner in which these points were raised during the trial, and the aspect in which they were presented. On account of this indefiniteness *it does not apprehend the precise views which they entertain.* They do, indeed, state "All we contend for is the fact that it is our privilege, as taught in the Scriptures and not gainsaid in the Standards, to accept as believers the Holy Ghost, the same as did the early Christians, and walk in Him as our joy, empowerer, and guide into all truth." To this statement by itself the Presbytery has no objection to offer. But the question returns, do the appellants believe that there are times when they are enabled to cherish "superlative" love to God, and to render "superlative" obedience? And it is apprehended, in the light of other statements made by them, that this is their meaning ; and it is held that neither the Scriptures, nor the Subordinate Standards of the Church, justify such views. Neither was this the experience of the early Christians. We know it is disclaimed by the Apostle Paul, who, when, according to his own experience as a believer, says "the good that I would I do not, but the evil that I would not that I do." "But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."

The Presbytery is gratified to learn that the appellants feel themselves not to be perfect in their understanding of these points, and, therefore, open to instruction. It trusts that they will continue to cherish and to exemplify this teachable spirit. It is a new experience to them, different from what they evinced when dealt with by the Session, for they acted as teachers, not as willing to be instructed, and it will be a new practice.

In view of these premises the Presbytery ask the Synod, after giving them due and full consideration, to dismiss the protest and appeal and affirm their judgment in sustaining the action of the Session of Knox Church.

At Bowmanville, and within St. Paul's Church there, Wednesday, the fifteenth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty nine years, which day the Synod of Toronto and Kingston having met, and been constituted.

Inter alia the Synod took up the Protest and Appeal of William Henry, and six others, against a decision of the Presbytery of Guelph, sustaining a judgment of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in suspending them from the fellowship of said Church, for holding and propagating views not in accordance with the Word of God and the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

It was ascertained, on enquiry, that all the parties in the case had been duly cited.

The parties having been called to the bar, there appeared Messieurs J. K. Cranston, J. D. Cranston, and A. B. Cranston, for themselves, and as representing the other four appellants, the Presbytery of Guelph, and the Moderator and Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt.

1. The papers in the case were read, consisting of Reasons of Protest and Appeal.

2. Minutes of Presbytery of Guelph, bearing on the case.

3. Answers of the Presbytery to the reasons of Protest and Appeal.

4. The action and procedure of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, in this case.

Mr. James K. Cranston, one of the appellants, was heard at length.

The Synod resumed consideration of the Appeal against a decision of the Presbytery of Guelph, interrupted by the special business taken up by the Court.

Messieurs John D. Cranston, and A. B. Cranston, the other appellants present, were severally heard.

Dr. Middlemiss was next heard, on behalf of the Presbytery of Guelph.

In the course of his pleadings the hour of adjournment arrived, and parties were removed from the bar.

Same day and place.

Mr. E. F. Torrance, M.A., Convener of the Committee on the State of Religion, having intimated that the report was not ready for distribution in printed form, it was decided to postpone the consideration thereof till to-morrow, and to proceed with the appeal against the Presbytery of Guelph, interrupted by the adjournment at six o'clock, p. m.

The parties in the case were recalled to the bar, and Dr. Middlemiss resumed, and brought to a close his pleadings, as a Commissioner of the Presbytery of Guelph.

Dr. Torrance, the other Commissioner, was also heard, on behalf of the Presbytery.

Mr. Alexander Jackson, Moderator of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, was then heard.

The appellants were heard in reply.

Questions were put and answered.

During the putting of questions, it was moved by Professor Maclaren, duly seconded and agreed to, that the order of business to-morrow morning be so far departed from, that, after the passing of the reports on Presbytery Records, the Synod continue to travel in the Appeal case, until it has been finally disposed of.

It was further resolved that the Synod now adjourn. Parties were removed from the bar.

Same place, Thursday, the sixteenth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine years. Which day the Synod of Toronto and Kingston having met and been constituted.

Inter alia the Synod resumed consideration of the Appeal against a decision of the Presbytery of Guelph, interrupted by the adjournment last night.

Parties were recalled to the bar.

Additional questions were put and answered.

Parties were removed from the bar.

The Synod proceeded to deliberate on the case.

After reasoning, the following deliverance was moved by Mr. J. Somerville, M.A., seconded by Mr. J. B. Fraser, M.D., and unanimously adopted.

The Synod, recognising the fact that the Appellants have had a full opportunity of defining their position before the Session of Knox Church, Galt, and before the Presbytery of Guelph, and have also had a full opportunity of stating their case before the Synod, and further recognising the fact that the doctrinal position of the Appellants is not in harmony with the Subordinate Standards of the Church, and the word of God, and that they declare that they are determined to teach the doctrinal views they at present hold, until convinced that they are mistaken, therefore the Synod resolves that—

The appeal be dismissed, and the action of the Presbytery of Guelph sustained.

Parties were recalled to the bar, and the foregoing decision announced to them by the Moderator.

The appellants, in their own name, and on behalf of those whom they represented, declined to acquiesce, and appealed to the General Assembly, indicted to meet in St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, on Wednesday, the twelfth day of June next, and craved extracts.

Extracts were ordered to be given to the appellants, as asked for by them.

The Presbytery of Guelph, and the Moderator and Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, both signified their acquiescence in the decision.

Principal Caven, D.D., Professor Maclaren, D.D., and Mr. J. Somerville, M.A., were appointed to answer the reasons of protest and appeal that may be given in by the appellants, and to defend the action of the Synod before the General Assembly.

It was decided that the papers in the case be printed at the expense of the appellants.

Extracted from the minutes of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston, by

JOHN GRAY,
Synod Clerk.

BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY.

The final trial took place in St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, commencing on the 17th of June, Rev. Dr. McMullen acting as Moderator.

After the reading of the appeal to the Assembly and the Synod's reply thereto (see page —) it was decided that the case should be heard throughout in open court, and that three parties on each side should address the Assembly. J. K. Cranston, J. D. Cranston and Mrs. A. Kay spoke for the appellants, and Rev. A. Jackson for Knox Church, Rev. D. Middlemiss for the Guelph Presbytery, and Rev. Dr. McLaren for the Synod.

James K. Cranston then gave in detail the whole circumstances of the differences which separated him and his coadjutors from Knox Church. He paid a high compliment to the life and labors of David Caldwell, one of the appellants, who "was a man of God. Many souls to-day were rejoicing who had been brought into the church through his instrumentality."

Meetings had been held in his own house for about two years, but he had no thought of opposing the Church. He loved his Church and had no desire to injure her. Those meetings had been blessed to the salvation of many souls in Galt.

There are many in Galt to-day who were going on the downward road, drunkards in some cases, who were rescued from sin, they are on the rock Christ Jesus, and are living witnesses of the good resulting from these so-called holiness meetings in Galt. In these meetings many Christians have entered into a brighter Christian experience, and have become very much more useful in the Master's service. There was, of course, a good deal of talk about the meetings and a great many stories were circulated about us which were very far from truth. Now the Session became alarmed because of these stories. They did not seem just to understand us, and possibly we did not express ourselves as fully as we might under some circumstances. The Session called us before them about the end of April. We objected to being dealt with in that meeting. We said that if there was anything wrong in our

lives or acts we were willing to put it right, but we wanted to be dealt with rightly. There was no legal trial held at that meeting, and we expressed ourselves freely in reference to some questions that were asked of us. Dr. Smith did not seem to understand us, whether it was our fault or his I do not know. At that meeting and the next we were asked several times if we believed in sinless perfection. We distinctly stated that we did not. Did we believe in progressive sanctification? Yes! We know that God has enabled us to grow in the knowledge of his truth day by day. At the next meeting we were asked to renounce the doctrine of sinless perfection. How could we renounce that doctrine when we had never accepted it? But that was not satisfactory, they insisted that we must renounce these doctrines.

We were notified that we were expelled from the Church, not suspended, but expelled, excommunicated. We appealed from that decision to the Guelph Presbytery, and we succeeded in our appeal, and the matter was sent back to Knox Church Session with assessors appointed to begin the case *de novo*.

The assessors met in November last, and certain questions were arranged and propounded to us. You know what they are—it is unnecessary for me to read them over. We were placed in a little back room and were called out one by one to be questioned. We were not treated with brotherly kindness, otherwise the brethren would have handed us the questions beforehand and asked us to consider them. No; we were kept in a back room, and one by one we were led down into the middle of the company. We did not know the first thing of the questions, nor what was going to be asked us by them. These difficult theological questions were thrown at us and we were told to answer them pertinently. Practically we were told to answer them Yes or No. I objected for my part. I objected to being dealt with because there was no specific charge against me, and I wished to be informed what the charge against me was. I was told, "We want you to answer these questions. You need not be afraid to answer them," we were told, "your answers will not be used to entrap you. You will have every opportunity of explaining yourselves fully." We were asked the questions and answered them as best we could on the spur of the moment. Was that anything like fairness and brotherly love? I trow not. That was not the spirit of our Master. I am sorry to say it.

They found us guilty of holding the doctrine of perfect holiness in this life, and that we had attained to it.

We held no meetings on Wednesday evenings, but on Tuesdays and Fridays. On some of the evenings there were district meetings, and we attended these meetings quite as often as other members.

It had been said that we importuned members to attend our meetings when we knew that other meetings were going on. The

only case of that kind I know of is that of Mr. McCallum, who came to my house one evening when our meeting was about opening. I thought he had come to hear for himself what we taught. But he asked where Mr. Elliott lived. I invited him to remain to the only meeting. When he had come to my own house, could I do less?

He then went on to deal with the irrelevant allegation against the appellants.

In closing Mr. Cranston said that he and those who thought with him only desired to serve God; if there was a better way than the one they had followed they wanted to learn and adopt it. He left the facts for the judgment of the Assembly.

ADDRESS OF J. D. CRANSTON.

MR. MODERATOR AND CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,—There is a sense in which we appear before you to-day with a measure of fear and trembling, not that we are perplexed or troubled with reference to the final decision which may be given by this Assembly. At the same time there is that feeling or "tendency" which might be described as one of shrinking from the law of obedience, under what might be looked upon as testing or trying circumstances. However, we feel assured that God is quite able and competent to maintain His own cause. Whilst it is true that we do not feel disposed to speak slightly or disparagingly of all the good that has been accomplished in His name in days gone by, but would rather bless His holy name for the good, still we cannot help thinking that there yet remains a great work to be done, and that we are just on the eve of a spiritual reformation, and when we say this we refer more particularly to reformation in the hearts and lives of many people in our churches to-day rather than a reformation in doctrines. Still we are glad to notice that efforts are being made towards the simplification of the statements of our Church creeds. Yet we feel confident that you cannot help but concur with us when we say that reformation is needed in the hearts and lives of many already inside the pale of the visible church. This movement which is afoot all over the land, and which, if you will, may be designated the Holiness movement, such movement we believe to be of God, notwithstanding the fact that a warning note has been sounded, and the people have been called upon to beware of the "Hydra headed monster."

That this warning has been given, and these charges made against this movement is not surprising. In fact it would be most surprising if they were not made, for every reformatory movement of the Church has met the same charge. In this respect history but repeats itself. When there is any different treatment from that

of former days it is conclusive proof that such a movement should be viewed with a suspicion that it may be spurious, for anything that is new in religion, says a great authority, is not true. While we admit that a charge of fanaticism does not prove that this movement is of God, we also admit that an absence of that charge would prove the movement to be not of God. History confirms our views that this charge is one of the marks of a genuine work of God.

The Rev. C. A. McLaughlin in his address to the Boston Convention amongst other things said that it was the custom of many to substitute epithets for arguments, to call names instead of referring to scriptural authority. Christ gives a parable to show how different it is for those who are depending on the dead forms of a past dispensation to accept the new life of a reformatory higher movement in these words, "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better." Its lesson, says Dr. L. Abbott, is one of patience to all Christian teachers, and to all reformers who must expect that men habituated to one form of life will not readily abandon it for a new and better way. "The old is good enough" is the common language of opposition to all reformers.

The movement calling for reform and advancement that excites no opposition, thereby betrays its identity as not of the truth. This is the testimony of history. Christ himself by His friends was accused, even of being beside Himself, "while His enemies declared He was possessed of the devil and was mad." The same charges were made concerning John the Baptist. "Jesus declared that one of the marks of blessedness was this very thing." So we see it was nothing new even in that day. Joseph was looked upon by his brethren as a fanatical dreamer, Noah an enthusiast. A preacher in England, a century ago, was lodged in jail because he had announced that he knew his sins were forgiven. Geo. Fox, and the early Quakers, McCheyne, of Scotland, Payson, of Portland, Edwards, of Northampton, the early abolitionists, Roger Williams and a host of others too numerous to mention, all passed more or less under the same stigma. So that a movement that rebukes worldliness and the spirit of mammon must always meet with more or less such accusations, if not it is spurious. So that the charge of heresy made against the present Holiness movement, which, if reformatory in character, is what might be expected, and is a recommendation rather than otherwise.

So that we would remind you here of the words which Gamaliel gave utterance to, when the apostles were before the council when he said: "For if this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." To this they agreed, that is, to let the apostles go; but we ask did they cease to teach and preach Jesus Christ, notwithstanding the fact that they had

been previously commanded not to teach in His name, and were accused with "having filled Jerusalem with their doctrine."

Was not the apostle Paul also charged with heresy in his day? In the 24th chapter of the book of Acts, when he appeared before Tertullus the orator, and when permitted to answer for his life and doctrines, amongst other things said. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which *they call* heresy, so worship I the God of my Fathers." And so now we have been charged with heresy, and have been looked upon by the Session of Knox Church, the Guelph Presbytery, and the Synod of Toronto and Kingston, as being unworthy communicants and have been barred, or denied the privilege of sitting down at the Lord's table. Does some one ask the reason why. We reply in a word, because that we have been proclaiming liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, and is not God calling upon his people to-day to go through, "go through the gates, prepare ye the way of the people, cast up, cast up the highway, gather out the stones, lift up a standard for the people." Do you think has not the standard been lowered in many of our Churches to-day?

In the American war a brave ensign got in advance of the faltering line. The flag was in danger of being captured. The captain shouted "Bring the colors back to the company." But just at that moment, a brave soldier dashed forward shouting "Bring the company up to the colors," and soon that flag was surrounded by a hundred fearless hearts. So we may lower God's standard, and bring it down to the level of our unbelief. Think you would it not be the better way to bring our faith up, so to speak, to the great and glorious standard of His mighty promises?

Dr. Middlemiss said at Bowmanville, that we were all agreed that the low spiritual condition of the membership of our Churches is to be acknowledged with sincere grief and humiliation. But we fear the low spiritual condition is due largely to the lowering of the standard of our Church by many of her teachers with reference to Christian liberty, (see chapter XX of Confession of Faith), and because of much indefinite teaching with reference to the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Seven young men in Glasgow, longing for an endowment of power for service, agreed to meet nightly to seek the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This they did for three weeks and besieged the throne of grace continually for this blessing. They wondered that when their all was on the altar that God did not manifest Himself to them and baptise them with the Holy Ghost. But God showed them where the mistake lay—faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God, and that as Jesus Christ was God's gift to them, waiting to be taken by simple faith, so in like manner the Holy Ghost, that Jesus said He would send in His Father's name, was to be received in just the same way, by simple faith. In either case waiting for a sense of power was the hindrance.

Let us look into the matter of divisive courses for a few minutes, and in order to do so it will be necessary to explain to you how the meetings that the appellants are holding originated.

In the summer of 1887 it was my privilege to attend a series of meetings, held specially for the consecration of believers. Notwithstanding the fact that my conversion to God was a positive fact, yet I frankly admit that at this time, and for many years, I had been striving to meet the demands of an enlightened conscience in living up to the standard of the Gospel as preached by Christ Himself. I say, notwithstanding these efforts to grow in grace, I met with much failure and discouragement, until at these meetings my attention was more particularly drawn to the work of the Holy Spirit as made known in the teachings of Christ, and brought out in the early history of the church.

Many of the Christians with whom it was my privilege to meet at this gathering gave testimony to the fact that they had received the Holy Ghost as their Comforter, Teacher, Guide, Empowerer for service, etc., and that they were walking in Him as taught by Christ, and illustrated by the early Christians. The result of which was that their experience now was one of victory over the world, the flesh and the devil, through the indwelling power of the Holy Ghost.

These truths were hailed by me with pleasure as I listened to them, as I had all but settled down to the conviction that the best experience one could expect in this life was one of alternate failure and victory, one hour sinning and the next repenting and beginning again, only to fail again and again to repent. However the truth began to dawn upon me as never before, that the Lord, Jesus when He laid down His precious life, had in His mind's eye a full and a complete redemption from sin, (Luke I, 74-75), that He would grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness, before him *all* the days of our life. A mighty work to do, but our Deliverer is able to do it. He came to destroy the works of the devil, and dare we dream for a moment that He is not able or willing to accomplish his purposes? Just in a word allow me to say that by a definite act of faith I received the Comforter in his various offices and thus far have been walking in Him, and that my life is now one of victory in place of defeat, and am rejoicing in the blessed truth that Jesus came to save us fully, now in this present life, from the power and dominion of sin, and to deliver us altogether out of the hands of our enemies.

Soon after my return to Galt I felt called upon of God, at the Wednesday evening prayer meeting, to give my testimony as to the reception of the Holy Ghost, as a personal indweller and as an abiding Guest, Comforter and Empowerer, also stating that the natural outcome of thus walking with God in the comfort and power of the Holy Ghost, was the living of a life well pleasing to

Him, being fruitful in every good work and increasing in the knowledge of God. At the same meeting I also said that I believed that it was when there was a complete consecration of all our powers to God, and only then, that we were in the right position to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, adding to these precious truths, that as we walked in Him we would be kept from sinning. This testimony, I am sorry to say, did not appear to be very well received by a number present.

However, I should have stated that prior to this we had held a meeting at my mother's home, and I don't know that there was scarcely any one present but the members of our own family, and it was my happy privilege to tell to them the good news regarding the Comforter, and that, if they would but receive Him in his various offices, and walk in Him, that they would find this to be the key note to a successful Christian life. "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and in Samaria," etc.—Acts i. 8.

How does this harmonize with the words of our pastor when he said if we would cease teaching our views they would gladly receive us back again into the Church? This would seem like a very reasonable request, but will it stand investigation? The word of God declares that after we are baptized with the Holy Ghost, we are to be witness bearers of the truth, beginning at Jerusalem. Now we do not claim this to be new truth, but rather the development of latent truth, or truth which has been mislaid for a time. But if it shall please God in his wondrous love to remove the scales from off our blind eyes, and reveal to us the truth along this line, we ask is it fair? is it kind? is it scriptural that our lips should be sealed? Accepting, as we do, the teaching of scripture as touching subjection to the powers that be, and this we have been endeavoring to carry out as far as practicable, still we maintain that no man has any right to come between the soul and God, lording it over God's heritage and thereby destroying Christian liberty—where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty.

We mention these things to show to you that the object of our starting these meetings was not divisive courses as some have thought, but the very opposite of that is true, as our object in the beginning and in the continuation of them, was that those of the members of the Church who chose to attend might be lifted into a higher plane of Christian experience, and thereby become better members of the Church and more efficient workers in the vineyard of the Lord.

With regard to the statement made by the Session, in their report to the Presbytery, that I had resigned the office of the eldership on the ground that I was not in accord with the Standards, permit me to say that when I was first cited to appear before the Session, and after a lengthened conference with the same, it was

moved by Dr. Vardon, seconded by Mr. Gibb, that two weeks from said meeting I be requested to answer categorically whether I could or could not accept the Confession of Faith in its entirety, and to which I replied that I accepted of it, in as far as I could understand it to be in harmony with the word of God, but not any farther, and to this the Moderator, the Rev. Mr. Dickson and Session said that they could not accept of my reply, but insisted upon me to answer them categorically. I then told them that I had difficulty in reconciling certain lines of teaching the one with the other, as given in the Confession of Faith. The construction put on this by the Moderator was that I was clearly out of harmony, and to which I replied in effect: That as you are seemingly determined, because of my difficulties in harmonizing certain clauses of the Confession of Faith, to interpret my attitude as being out of harmony with the Standards, I would resign the office of the eldership.

And just here I would refer you to what Professor Caven, Dr. Kellog, Rev. Mr. McDonnell, and Rev. Mr. Milligan recently stated regarding this point. They said in effect that ministers and elders are not asked to subscribe to everything taught in the Confession of Faith.

It has been stated by one of the lower courts, that we are not charged with teaching absolute perfection. The facts are these: They have accused us and say we are guilty of teaching and experiencing perfect holiness. We happened to use the words "absolute perfection" as synonymous with perfect holiness, in our appeal to the Synod. They, the Guelph Presbytery, saw a distinction here, and acted as if it were of vast importance. Well, we do not see the distinction, and meant the one when using the other expression. Now, if in such a play about words, the result of an argument, were simply such as might appear in a private conversation we might not criticize it severely; but when on such matters they base expulsion from the Lord's Table it does seem that a section of the dark ages has been brought into the 19th century. Our argument was, that if by perfect holiness the Session meant to imply that we believe we have attained to absolute perfection, they have wrongfully judged us, or if they meant that we think that we have arrived at a state which precludes further growth in grace or knowledge of divine things we reiterate they have wrongfully judged us.

Again, we protest against the whole spirit of the proceedings against us, in that they are based on the erroneous thought that members of the Church must be so well up in the Standards as to be able to give Yes and No answers to all questions propounded, without in any way having these answers conflict, that is in the least. We maintain that is impossible to any man.

Is it not true that questions might be propounded to ministers and elders of our Church to which, if they were asked to give

practically categorical answers, they would suddenly find themselves to be out of harmony with not only the Standards but the Word of God as well. For instance, we might ask you this question: Do you commit sin? The lower courts have decided that all believers do sin daily in thought, word and deed. In one place the Word of God says: "He that committeth sin is of the devil," etc., so that you can see at once the great disadvantage we labored under, being practically confined to Yes and No answers.

The wise men who framed the creed of our Church stated themselves that scripture must be compared with scripture to secure its full meaning. (See clauses 8, 9, 10 of Confession of Faith.)

We apprehend the Church's object is to teach right doing rather than orthodox creeds, and this whole investigation cannot but awaken the suspicion that it is because we are trying to carry out this thought that opposition is evinced. And our supposed beliefs are magnified as if serious evils, when those members who cross the border line of right doing attract no Church anathemas.

But again we fail to see why heterodoxy should be set over against correct living, as if a taint of the one more than vitiated the other. With the Roman Catholic Church in the former ages we can understand this, because it was really fighting against right doing in the interest of self-interest, but how too much holiness can injure our Church, unless she, too, has become somewhat worldly in her aims, we fail to see. If this is the cause then, of course we must expect that all our efforts after holy living will be antagonized by this spirit; but if, as we still hope and trust, our Church is founded on righteous living, and rejoices in the spread of right doing, that is holy living, we cannot but look for its fullest sympathy in striving to walk in all the commands and ordinances blameless, and expect to secure its hearty congratulations.

The question was asked at one of the previous meetings, if we are to be understood as believing that the Holy Ghost is poured out upon all believers in the same manner, form and degree, and for in all respects the same purposes that He was in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Our reply to this question was: Now that the Holy Ghost, has been given, and as we are living in the dispensation of the Spirit, it is the privilege of one and all to receive Him, and walk in Him, and so be filled with the Spirit. We are told that on the day of Pentecost they were all filled with the Holy Ghost; so may we to-day. They also asked, can we have Him in the same degree and for the same purposes. We reply, He is a person, and that if it were necessary for us to-day to do the same work that God in His infinite wisdom thought it necessary to be done then, He could and would undoubtedly enable us to perform as great works to-day. For example, when any one receives the Holy Ghost, they receive the Empowerer who fits them for service, whatever that service may be. But let us be clearly understood here. We haven't any right to dictate to the

Lord as to what that service should be, as it is ours to abide in Him and do His will. Jesus said "He came not to do His own will but the will of His Father." So it is ours not only to surrender our wills to Him, but allow Him to work in us and through us all the good pleasure of His will. But this is just where the shoe pinches many people, they begin to count the costs and are afraid of the consequences. It means much to follow Jesus all the way, so that when we speak of receiving the Holy Ghost in a Pentecostal sense we mean that we are filled, and that through His indwelling power we are enabled to do the will of God daily, whatever that may mean.

But just here we would like to ask every minister and elder of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, if the question were put to you whether you were in harmony with the Confession of Faith in every particular, and nothing but a Yes and No answer permitted, how many would answer Yes? And should we, because of our admitted difficulty, be denied church privileges, while ministers and elders who are notoriously out of harmony with chap. 3, Confession of Faith, on God's eternal decrees, and other clauses of the same Standards.

Recently it has been stated by members of the Presbytery of Toronto that the Westminster Confession of Faith errs both by excess and defect, and requires both to be amended by addition and subtraction. But we have not yet heard of any steps being taken to cut off from fellowship those thus expressing themselves. Does this look like justice or fair play?

Again we have always thought it remarkably strange that only a few of these professing and teaching the experience that we speak of should have been singled out and be debarred from Church privileges in the Church of their choice, when there were a number of others at that time, and who are still enjoying the same experience, and teaching the same truths. When your appellants were cited to appear before the Session several others asked permission to be tried with them, intimating that they were one with us. As an instance of this we might mention the name of Miss McKenzie, who walked two miles into the country, requesting her elder to cite her with the others, telling him she held and taught the same truths, but this he refused to do. This lady is now a missionary with Hudson Taylor in China.

GROWTH IN GRACE.

But now once more and with reference to our views on growth in grace. Where the believer has been brought to the point of entire surrender and finds himself dwelling and walking in a life of happy communion, the question naturally arises, "Is this the end?" We answer emphatically "No, it is only the beginning," and yet this is so little understood, that one of the greatest objec-

tions made against the advocates of this life of faith is, that they do not believe in growth in grace, and are supposed to teach that the soul arrives at a state of perfection, beyond which there is no advance. As exactly the opposite of this is true, and none would grieve more than we do at the thought of any finality in the Christian life, beyond which there can be no advance.

But then we believe in growing that does really produce maturity and in a development that as a fact does bring forth fruit. No parent would be satisfied with the growth of his child if day after day and year after year it remained the same helpless babe, it was in the first months of its life. Growth to be real must be progressive, and the days and weeks and months must see a development and increase of maturity in the thing growing. But is this the case with a large part of that which is called growth in grace? Are there not many Christians who seem to be putting forth strenuous efforts to grow, and yet if one should ask them at the end of a year, or five years, as the case might be, if they realized that they had been growing in grace and how much more unworldly and devoted to the Lord they were now than when they began their Christian life, what would be their reply, if honestly given? In a multitude of cases we fear the testimony would be one of failure in place of growth.

The children of Israel wandering in the wilderness are a perfect picture of this sort of growing. They travelled around for forty years, taking many weary steps and finding but little rest from their wanderings, and yet at the end of it all were no nearer the promised land than they were at the beginning. All their wanderings and fighting in the wilderness had not put them in possession of one inch of the promised land. To our minds at least the secret lies here. That our will, which is the spring of all our actions, was in the fall handed over into the control of Satan, and he has been working it in us to our utter ruin and misery. Now, God says, "Yield yourselves up unto me, as those that are alive from the dead, and I will work in you to will and to do of my good pleasure," and the moment we thus yield ourselves, without any reservations, receiving the Comforter divine, He of course takes possession of us, and does work in us "that which is well pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ," giving us the mind that was in Christ, and transforming us into His image.—Rom. xii. 1.

To grow in grace is opposed to all self-dependence, to all self-effort, to all legality of every kind. It is to put our growing, as well as everything else, into the hands of the Lord and leave it with Him. It is to grow as the lilies grow, or as the babes grow, without a care and without anxiety. Surely this is what our Lord meant when He said, "consider the lilies how they grow, they toil not neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." Or when He says again, "Which of you by taking thought, can add one cubit

unto his stature?" There is no effort in the growing of a child or a lily. They do not toil nor spin, stretch nor strain. They do not make any effort of any kind to grow, still they grow. If each one of us could but realize how helpless we are in this matter of growing, I am convinced, a large part of the strain would be taken out of our lives at once. It is plain, therefore, that the essential thing is to get within us the growing life, and then we cannot help but grow. And this life is the life hid with Christ in God; the wonderful divine life of an indwelling Holy Ghost.

CONFESSING SIN.

We have a word or two to say with reference to question No. 4, which was submitted to your appellants. The question reads as follows; "Do you believe that there are any seasons in the experience of the believer, when he does not need to confess sin?" Evidently those who arranged these questions, think there are no seasons in the earthly experience of the Christian when they do not need to confess sin, else they would not have propounded such a question. To have sin to confess must necessarily mean that sin has been committed, so if there are no seasons in which the believer does not require to confess sin, this would mean that the believer is living in sin, whereas the word of God says, that "Jesus came to save His people from their sins," and not in them, and Paul says, "we are not to continue in sin that grace may abound." In the answer by the Synod to reason No. 8 of our appeal it is stated that believers sin daily in thought, word and deed, and as there are no seasons in which we are not sinning, would it not be in keeping with that line of teaching and doctrine, that the believers whole time should be occupied in confessing. The question that arises and suggests itself here, to our minds, is this: are all such believers convicted by the Holy Ghost of sinning, which involves a deliberate consent of the will to what is evil; if so, then it must mean that believers live in sin, which we cannot believe is the teaching of the word of God, nor yet the Standards of our Church. We ask whose office is it to convict of sin? Is it not the office of the Holy Ghost; and is He not faithful in this respect, showing us when there is danger of being overcome by the enemy of our souls, saying to us, this is the way, walk ye in it?

But if at any time the Christian refuses to give heed to his Guide and instructor, listening rather to the evil suggestions of the wicked one, thereby harboring evil thoughts, such an one undoubtedly has sinned, and sin ought at once to be confessed. We never have held at any time of our Christian experience that we could not sin. But we do hold and believe that "greater is He who is in us than he that is in the world," and that through His indwelling power, we obtain the victory over the world, the flesh and the devil. So that the life of the Christian ought to be one of praise and thanksgiving, rather than one of constant confession. Does not the Word of God say that (I. Cor. x. 13) "There

hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man. But God is faithful and will not suffer us to be tempted above that ye are able to bear, but will with the temptation make a way of escape, that ye may be able to bear it;" also II. Thess. iii. 3—"But the Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you and keep you from evil."

ATTAINING TO PERFECTION.

With reference to having attained to perfection in this life, we disclaim having attained, because we believe there is progress in the divine life as we have already stated. The enduement of power for service is not an attainment, but an obtainment. We cannot earn the baptism of the Holy Ghost, nor can we climb up to it, nor can we win it, as it is the promise of the Father, and must be received by faith. And this baptism can only be received when the believer realizes his utter helplessness and presents himself to God a living sacrifice, which is his reasonable service. By receiving the Comforter, and walking in Him, there is steady advancement and the fruits of the Spirit will be manifest in the life. While holding to the view that it is our privilege to walk well pleasing unto the Lord, rendering a loving obedience, we state now what we have stated before at some of the examinations, that we believed all that God requires of us is to render a loving child-like obedience. For example, you ask your child to do a piece of work for you, the child does it, and you are pleased with the performance of it, not that the child does the work in the manner nor with the perfection that you yourself could do it, at the same time you commend him for his loving obedience and honest effort to please you. So in like manner is our Heavenly Father pleased with us, not that our service is complete in the absolute sense, not that it is as grand a service as it will be say ten years after this if we abide in and follow Him. Nevertheless there is a sense in which we believe that God is just as well pleased with the service of to-day as He will be with the service rendered ten years hence.

TENDENCY.

With reference to our old man and his evil tendencies.

We believe it is our privilege, through the power of the indwelling Christ, to reckon our old man, with his evil tendencies, as crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin and be dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. We believe with the Confession of Faith and the word of God that they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts, and being made free from sin we have our fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life. The Evidences of true faith states that obedience to the law must flow from love, and love from a pure heart, and a pure heart from a good conscience, and a good conscience from faith unfeigned. That unfeigned faith is able to make the conscience good, the heart pure, the man lovingly obedient to the law and will not suffer the heart to entertain the love of sin. These words, it will be observed, are taken from the Confession of Faith.

It is a fact admitted generally that by the constant overcoming, or the obtaining of victory over, what might be looked upon as

being the weakest part of a person's nature, in time such part will become the strongest part of his nature. For example, we take the case of a man who has acquired an appetite for strong drink, which appetite was looked upon as being his besetting sin. It is not an unusual thing to hear such persons rise up and give a testimony of this description. The love, or tendency, or desire for strong drink has been completely taken away, removed, or, as one person said to me, that he had no more love for it now, or desire in that direction, than if he never had tasted it. Now, we say if God can save a man from his greater or besetting sins, can He not save him from his lesser ones?

But does some one say, Is it not true that in some instances such persons again become victims to their old appetite? Yes, it is true. For this reason, if it were not possible to fall in an hour of temptation, such an one would be an infallible creature.

LONGINGS AND DESIRES.

We are free moral agents, and when temptation is presented to us in any form the temptation presented is not in itself sinful. But, if the suggestion of the enemy is entertained, harbored, or conceived in the heart, sin has been committed, even though it be not brought forth in actual transgression, but simply manifests itself in longings and desires. These must be confessed as sin and expelled from the soul. Our only safety in the hour of temptation is at once to recognize the presence of the Holy Ghost with us and in us, and allow the tempter and sin to encounter Him, not us. For greater is He that is with us and in us than he that is in the world.

The question might be asked, Do you claim to occupy the same position Adam did before the fall? No, we do not. Adam, before his fall, was a perfect creature, and was capable of rendering a perfect service to his Maker, able to keep the perfect law perfectly. Through Adam's fall, and our connection with him, and actual transgressions, all our powers have been and are impaired. So that we are physically and mentally incapable of rendering that perfect service which we otherwise could have rendered, had we not been so injured; our best services are imperfect. But if rendered with a child-like love, and a willing mind, such service, through the mediation of our Intercessor, is acceptable and well pleasing to God.

The question might be asked by some one, Do you think that this imperfection of service ought not to be confessed as sin? We reply, that we do confess our incapability and utter helplessness, and can never look upon ourselves but with deep humility and self-abasement. It is acknowledged by all that the consequences of sin still remain. But take, as an instance, the case of the prodigal son, who no doubt incapacitated himself by riotous living; yet when he came back and made confession, his father gladly received him, and forgave him all, and put on him the best robe. No doubt that son would never be able to forgive himself for sinning against such a loving father. But suppose that son was all the time coming to his father, and saying to his father, "Oh father! forgive me!" We can fancy his father looking unto his eyes saying, "My dear son, have I not already told you I had forgiven you? Do not, I beseech of you, grieve me by constantly reminding me of your past disobedience. Can't

you believe that I meant what I said, when I frankly forgave you?" We can imagine the father saying to him, "Why, have you been disobedient again, my son? If not, I do not wish to hear about the other."

In conclusion some one may ask, Has the flesh or principle of evil no place in you? The location of sin is a matter of comparative indifference to us, so long as sin is not having dominion over us. We read with pleasure in the columns of the *Globe* a sermon by the Rev. John Burton of Toronto, and in which he said: "There is but one Lord, one statement about one Lord, one faith, one confession or form of faith, one baptism, one mode and subject of baptism. If a poor sinner has learnt enough about our Lord to trust Him as he is being lead to the great presence in peace, and receive an unction from the Holy One, to walk humbly with his God, why should he be confronted with any of the distinctions of Nicene Creed between one substance and like substance; or puzzled about predestination, or even worried about some statement on eternal punishment, or about the form of the Apostolic Church? You ask are not these questions important? Yes, so is the question of who built the pyramids. But that the body of Christ should be rent, the great family of believers divided, because it cannot be accurately determine when the Episcopacy began, where God's sovereignty meets first with man's freedom, or obedience judged by the form in which water baptism is administered, is to me more than a blunder, it is a sin against Him whose priestly prayer enshrined the petition that His disciples might be one even as He and His Father are." So we might very reasonably ask: Is it right to ask your appellants to locate sin?

J. D. CRANSTON.

Mrs. Kay was next heard. She said after living a professedly Christian life for nearly twenty-four years—a life of attempts and failures to attain an ideal Christian life—she found the Spirit of the Lord made her so desperately sick of sinning that she made a covenant with the Lord that she would make any sacrifice to put her through. Bro. Caldwell came to her, and kept continually talking about the baptism of the Spirit. She did not know what he meant until he told her one day that he had lost his bad temper, (for he had a bad temper, and it had got him into many scrapes.) She observed the difference in Mr. Caldwell, and therefore resolved and made a covenant with the Lord, and she went at night and said, "Lord, if thou wilt keep me from sin I will go through anything that is right in Thy sight to put me through." This explains why I am here to-day.

The Lord answered her request, and on confessing it, she got into trouble right away, as she was told that she was professing *sinless perfection*. But she found she had victory over sin. She had been saved from sinning by the Lord, and in her own experience she had gained the victory over sin. This tendency to sin, that had been spoken of, after taking counsel with the Lord, she believed to be sin, but a condition of or tendency to sin should not be that of the Christian. There was such a thing as a clean heart—cleansed by the blood of the Lamb and kept clean by the Holy Ghost—and with such a heart one could take a good tongue-thrashing without resenting it one bit.

She gave a short history of her experience in connection with the various trials before the Church courts and how she was tempted by the enemy not to go before the Courts because there would be a great array of theology there ; but the Lord made it plain to her that she was to go. She reminded the Assembly how that Dr. Smith, her then pastor, had, twenty years ago, been brought before the Church courts, and how God had honored and blessed him for his fidelity to the truth.

Rev. Alex. Jackson, on behalf of the Session of Knox Church, Galt, gave a brief resume of the case. He said that it had been a practical necessity for the peace of the Church that this action had been taken in this matter. He had nothing personal in the matter because it had all been done under his predecessor before he arrived in Canada, and he simply wished to act as an impartial judge in the matter. There were three elders who resigned their positions in the Church in sympathy with these brethren, but because they had not obtruded their opinions and made trouble in the Church were allowed to remain in it and were members in good standing still. He read several extracts from minutes which were not contained in the printed record.

He explained the informality in the first citation by the Session as owing to the extreme delicacy of his predecessor and through a desire on the part of the Session to avoid trouble. Mr. Caldwell was accused of creating trouble in the Church by proclaiming his peculiar views in the prayer meeting, especially during the absence of Dr. Smith in California. Mr. Macpherson would corroborate him. For five months the Session bore with the disturbances of these brethren. At the close of a large prayer meeting Mr. Jas. Cranston got up, and in a demonstrative way proceeded to say that a great many of them were mouthpieces of the devil, and if they would only go to the meetings of the appellants they would find that God was blessing them. These peculiar notions were regularly inculcated. The reason why the members were dealt with individually in the Session was that he wanted to reclaim them ; if not all, some of them. He did his level best to get the ladies out of the scrape. These things were taught systematically in the Church, and the whole Session of Knox Church—the whole board—would certify that these gentlemen boasted that the Session did not dare to touch them. They challenged the Session. They were not as quiet and unobtrusive as they pretended to be. These were things with which the Session had to deal. If they had disciplined Mr. Caldwell four years ago the Session felt they would not have had so many to deal with now. A committee then waited on Mr. Jas. Cranston to deal with him regarding his conduct in the prayer meeting. Every step that had been taken he had consulted with some of the wisest men in the Presbyterian Church, and the reason why he had remained silent was that he felt that most of those interested were the victims of abuse. Mr. Cranston stated that the Session had become alarmed at their progress. This was true, and it would have been better for the Church if it had become alarmed long before. They were boasting that they were making proselytes and that the room they had for holding their meeting was filled. In the Session meeting where the two elders resigned owing to their sympathy for these

people, James Cranston shouted, "Glory Hallelujah, there's more to follow." One of the Cranston brothers rose in the same meeting and said that Ichabod was written on the walls of Knox Church. The excommunication was done at this meeting, but he found afterwards that the Session did not possess this power, and that there was an indiscretion committed. Before they went to the Presbytery he pointed this out to the Session, and they were ready to acknowledge that an indiscretion had been committed. Mr. Cranston also, at a previous meeting of the Session at which Dr. Smith presided, jumped up with an open Bible in his hand and shouted "You do not know anything of this Book. You should learn something about it before attempting to preach the Gospel." The action of the Presbytery was, that whereas the Session had erred in its action, and not having presented sufficient details of the case, the case was referred back in order to give the appellants the fullest benefit of their interpretation of the laws of the Church. Dr. Smith's absence all the winter gave these people the opportunity of developing this matter to the extent it had obtained. He did not think that it would have ever come before the courts if he had been in charge all that time. They went over the case from the beginning in order to give the Presbytery all possible information regarding it. In answer to the complaint of the appellants that they had been compelled to answer "Yes" or "No" to the questions put to them by the Presbytery, Mr. Jackson said that they had found in dealing with those people that they avoided the main point of issue and answered the questions in a prevaricative form. It was therefore found necessary to keep them to the point and forbid them to theorize, explaining at the same time that they would have plenty of time to give an elaborate statement. On different occasions during the progress of this case delegations had gone from the Session and dealt privately with these people with a view to getting them to stop pushing their views upon others, but they had been time and again rebuffed and told that they courted discipline. In the progress of this whole case he (the speaker) had made but one slip, and the appellants had made the most of it. This was in connection with the pew rent debt referred to so triumphantly by J. K. Cranston this morning.

Dr. Middlemiss, of Elora, believed there was no more important subject in relation to the spiritual life of the people before the Assembly than this question of the Knox Church difficulty. He protested against the use of ambiguous terms by the appellants with a view to giving the impression that they had been cast out of the kingdom of God and delivered up to the kingdom of Satan. The committee had done the very best that they could with safety to the welfare of the church. The speaker then went elaborately into the Scriptural and doctrinal aspect of the question. He summed up the whole matter as follows:—It is not, Can God give such grace that the believer may live without sin? but, has He so ordained and promised to impart such grace? The whole pleadings, both written and spoken, of the appellants show that they claim that they have had a communication of Divine grace, which we believe God makes to no man in this life. This doctrine must, from the nature of it, result in great danger to the spiritual condition of those

who hold it. If we believe we have received a blessing from God which we have not received we are practising a deceit upon ourselves. Dr. Middlemiss closed with expressing the hope that no uncertain sound would go forth from the Assembly in reference to the matter, and that thus the four courts of the Presbyterian Church would stand unanimously arrayed against such a dangerous doctrine.

Rev. Dr. McLaren represented the Synod of Toronto and Kingston. He briefly reviewed the different aspects of the case which had been alluded to by the previous speakers. He said that the procedure of the lower courts in reference to this matter was in accordance with the regulations of the church books. He would say on behalf of the Synod that they did not elucidate a single idea from the appellants that they could not have claimed from the records of the case which came before them. They were charged with holding erroneous views and disturbing the church. They said they did not entertain absolute or sinless perfection, but they said they had attained to an experience wherein they had no consciousness of sin. This seemed to him a play upon words. Either these people had no sin for which they could honestly ask forgiveness or they were living under a delusion. At any rate they had these experiences which could only result from absence of sin or spiritual blindness. He could not understand this otherwise. He asked could this teaching be in accordance with the Standards of their Church? He thought not. It was not necessary to say a single word in addition to what Dr. Middlemiss had said in answer to this question. It was said in the sixth chapter of the Confession of Faith that there was corruption in the lives of those who were regenerated, that all through there was truly and properly sin. This was unmistakably the teaching of all the Reformed Churches and in the Presbyterian Church all the world over. The teaching of the Lutheran Church was also distinct on this point. In regard to the teaching of the Scripture he said it was in some respects more important. It seemed to him that there was no reference to their views in the Bible. These appellants appealed to the Scriptures to support their teaching of these peculiar views. The Scriptures did not supply any similar experiences which would in the least correspond to those which these gentlemen described as taking place in them. Paul, he believed, had experienced something of these intermittent fits before his conversion. He did not tell of this that others might imitate it, but as a warning that they might avoid it. The Scriptures expressly denied such freedom from sin as these expressions implied. There were no just men on earth who did not sin. It was not the purpose of God that such grace should be bestowed in men's lives that they should be conscious of freedom from sin, and that periods should come when they could not say "Lord forgive us our debts." This implied the presence of sin. The Scriptures did not recognize it as a possible attainment that anyone should reach a condition where he had no consciousness of sin. The appellants were plainly in error both in regard to the Church standard and the teachings of the Holy Bible itself.

N.B.—The report of these three addresses is taken from the *Mail verbatim*.

J. D. Cranston replied on behalf of the appellants as follows :

It is evident to us as the trial has gone on that the whole question is narrowed down to the inbeing of sin. It is true that the many charges or insinuations compromising to the moral character of the appellants have not been finally withdrawn, but it seems patent to us that the vote about to be taken will in no wise be influenced by these allegations. So we content ourselves in reiterating our statement of being perfectly willing on any and all occasions to meet our accusers, before any tribunal with proofs as to their falsity. However, as a further reason for not entering minutely into these accusations, we draw attention to the fact that Mr. Jackson made equally strong statements at former trials, and even put them in public print, and when challenged as to their correctness he neither undertook to substantiate or withdraw them. For example, he stated that no persons were rescued from open sin at our meetings, or words to that effect. His attention was drawn December 29th, 1888, to his error, and we offered to go with him any day to the homes of several who had been so rescued and introduce him to them, that he might hear their own statements. He never called and has never taken back his statements.

As an instance of how Mr. Jackson changes the meaning of a statement by the introduction of or the changing of words, he stated yesterday on the Assembly floor, that J. K. Cranston had accused those present at a meeting, "as being mouthpieces of the devil." Now, what are the facts of the case, and what did J. K. C. state upon that occasion? for I was present at that meeting and Mr. Jackson was not, so I will not give it to you second-handed. James, after having consecrated himself to the Lord, found it not only necessary to consecrate himself, but his business as well, having at this time in stock some light literature and playing cards, which he felt he could not conscientiously continue selling, were by him destroyed. False and damaging reports were circulated with reference to his not having destroyed them, and this, too, by members of the Church, so that at a prayer meeting in closing his remarks, he called attention to the fact that the reports were false which were being circulated, adding that parties who would now circulate reports which there was not truth in, would be allowing themselves "to be mouthpieces for the devil." This, you will observe, named no one, consequently Mr. Jackson's statement was misleading. But again, and with reference to your appellants having boasted and challenged the Session to deal with them, I am inclined to think that he had reference to an interview which I myself had with one of the elders, prior to my resigning the eldership. What took place upon that occasion is as follows: During the conversation with said elder this movement was mentioned, and after talking the matter over with him I said that if they considered me in error, or teaching error, they ought undoubtedly to have the courage of their convictions and cite me to appear before them, also adding that not to do so was not courageous, when they thought that the seed that was being sown by me was not the good seed of the gospel.

Once more, as touching what Mr. Jackson stated, viz., that J. K. Cranston accused Dr. Smith of not knowing his Bible, is simply false. Mr. Cranston never accused Dr. Smith of not knowing his Bible.

AN EXPLANATION WHICH APPEARED IN THE "GLOBE" JANUARY 18TH, FROM MR. JACKSON.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to correct your report of the Guelph Presbytery in one particular? One relative of Mr. Henry paid to church support in 1886; but *he* never did.

ALEX. JACKSON.

Galt, Jan. 18th.

It will be noticed that this explanation of Mr. Jackson's can scarcely be called a retraction but a reiteration of the charges made against Wm. Henry, whereas it is well known and easily proved that Wm. Henry paid the major part of what was paid in 1886, 1887.

FROM THE "MAIL," JAN. 19TH, NOTICE WHAT A TORONTO LAWYER SAYS WITH REFERENCE TO THESE CHARGES.

SIR,—I noticed in the report furnished you of the Guelph Presbytery anent to the Galt "Heresy Case," that certain of the accused, were convicted of "gross and deliberate falsehood." It strikes me that if such were true it were better to expel these erring members for such a charge, rather than for "Heresy." The Session not preferring such a charge is *prima facie* evidence that it cannot be sustained and is therefore false.

Yours,

FAIR PLAY.

Now we might go on for almost an unlimited length of time refuting irrelevant charges, but it would not be judicious on our part to occupy longer of your valuable time with them, but regret exceedingly that these matters were introduced in connection with this case. However, you all know we are not responsible for their introduction.

In reply to Dr. Middlemiss, regarding inbred sin, we say now what we said yesterday morning, that the location of sin is a matter of comparative indifference to us, so long as sin is not having dominion or reigning in our mortal bodies. We ask why ought we to be worried as to the location of sin? and is the body of Christ to be rent and the great family of believers divided because we cannot accurately define or locate sin. To do so, as the Rev. Mr. Burton of Toronto says, (with reference to some other matters which are deemed important,) would be more than a blunder, it would be a sin against Him whose priestly prayer enshrined the petition that his disciples might be one, even as He and His Father are one.

In our teaching, we confine ourselves largely to the receiving of the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the walking in Him as our Joy, Empowerer and Guide into all truth, and obedience to the Holy Spirit as the one law of life, which will secure for the believer a life of perfect peace, perfect joy and perfect soul rest.

God's rest did not come until His work was over; ours will not. In many cases believers begin Christian life by working and trying to keep the law, struggling in the energy of the flesh, work, work, work, thinking that progress is to be made in the divine life by such efforts, which

result only in one failure after the other, forgetting all the while that there must be a ceasing from our own works, as God did from His. Betimes you will hear people complaining of their weakness, inefficiency for Christian work, etc., but in many such cases these same parties are too strong in place of being too weak. If we would only allow our hands to hang down, so to speak, and allow the blessed Holy Ghost to come in in all His fulness,—He who is the Sanctifier, the Guide into the truth and Empowerer for service,—then rest would be obtained, and victory secured over the world, the flesh and the devil. We agree with Dr. McLaren in his remarks about tarrying for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, because there is a sense in which tarrying is unnecessary. We have been particular in our contention that it was not necessary to wait for the baptism of the Holy Ghost but rather we emphasize that this baptism of power may and ought at once to be received by faith on the part of those who have not received the promise of the Father. D. L. Moody, who might be quoted here as a recognized authority, when speaking of the endowment of power for service said: "That many people when spoken to with reference to the necessity of being fully equipped and baptized for service will say to you, that they don't need to wait or tarry, but go on working. Well," says Moody, "they might just as well wait until they are endued with power, for they are losing their time very largely anyway." But, perhaps some one may say here that Dr. McLaren and Moody do not agree, but clash; one says, "there is no need of tarrying," whilst the other says, "tarry." In our opinion they are both right, if properly understood, for this reason: In the first place, it is the privilege of those who do at once fulfil the conditions to receive the promise of the Father without tarrying, while on the other hand, if the person be not willing to fulfil such conditions, such persons go on working without unction, and, as Moody very properly says, they had better tarry, for after all they are very largely losing their time. The conditions are, "a presenting of our bodies a living sacrifice holy and acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service."—Romans, xii. 1. "And we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him."—Acts, v. 32. "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."—Acts i. 8.

As to this being a high attainment, or great spiritual excellence in us, we see no place for boasting. As the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a gift and received by faith, boasting is excluded.

In closing our remarks, we wish positively to state that we have no dogmatic views regarding the location of sin. Permit us to add that hitherto the burden of our teaching has been with reference to the receiving of the Comforter in His various offices, and the walking in Him as our joy and guide into all truth. So that we now ask of you, fathers and brethren in our Lord Jesus, to sustain our appeal, and set aside the verdicts of the lower courts, restoring to us the former rights and privileges enjoyed by us individually and respectively, and thanking you for the kind and patient hearing you have given us.

THE APPELLANTS DELUGED WITH QUESTIONS.

Rev. Dr. McMullen said it was now in order to put questions to the parties, all to be addressed directly to the chair.

Rev. Dr. Ure, Goderich—Do I understand that charges of misrepresentation are included in the indictment?

The ex-Moderator—No.

Mr. Jackson—No.

Rev. Dr. Ure—To what extent then were the divisive courses followed, were they so far as to endanger the peace of the congregation?

Rev. Alex. Jackson—Emphatically yes—very largely, yes.

Rev. Dr. Ure (to the appellant John Cranston)—What do you mean by the location of sin? I am puzzled myself to know where it is located.

Mr. Cranston—My friend said he was puzzled as to the location of sin. Now that is exactly my predicament. (Laughter.)

Rev. Dr. Ure—You are asked, Mr. Cranston, as to whether sin is located in the heart or in the flesh. It is said sin dwells in the believer?

Mr. Cranston—That puzzles the best of you theologians.

Dr. Ure—There can be no sin in your fingers.

Mr. Cranston thought that was just his position—that when sin was removed from the heart the body cannot sin.

Rev. Dr. MacVicar, Montreal—What do you mean by the heart?

Mr. Cranston—We are told the carnal mind is at enmity to God, and not subject to the laws of God. Or when carnality or enmity is removed from the heart opposition is taken away and our whole tendency is Godward, heavenward—not downward.

Rev. Dr. MacVicar—When sin is removed, does it mean the removal of something spiritual or physical?

One of the lady appellants—Spiritual.

James K. Cranston—Sin is something spiritual.

John D. Cranston—Sin is the transgression of the law of God.

Rev. Dr. MacVicar—Is it defilement or merely voluntary?

Mr. John D. Cranston—Both.

Rev. Geo. Haddow, Dalhousie—I heard the appellant state yesterday that he did not believe in the doctrine of sinless perfection, but believes in the doctrine of sanctification. At times, he said, he had no consciousness of sin. I want to know if, during those times, he believes himself to be in a state of sinless perfection?

James K. Cranston—No.

Rev. G. Munro, Embro—Are there times when you do not feel the necessity of confessing sin or to use the petition in the Lord's Prayer?

Mr. John D. Cranston—There are times, as I said, when we have the smile of our heavenly Father and His conscious approval resting on us, and we do not feel under the slightest condemnation.

Rev. Mr. Munro repeated the question—Are there times in the lives of the appellants when they do not feel under the necessity of confessing sin?—asking for a direct answer.

Rev. J. Hay, Campbellford, rose to a point of order, stating that the appellants should not be asked to give a categorical answer.

Rev. Dr. MacMullen said he did not wish to tie the appellants down harshly.

Mr. John D. Cranston, replying, said: I stated frankly that there were times when we do not feel any consciousness of having sinned, when God's smile is upon us, and when we are walking in sweet union and fellowship with the Father. Our life should be one of praise and thanksgiving, rather than one of constant confession of sinning.

Rev. Dr. McVicar—Would Mr. Cranston refuse to be described as sinful at those times when he refuses to confess his sin?

Mr. Cranston—No, sir, I would not refuse. We are sinners saved by the grace of God.

Rev. Dr. MacVicar—Then Mr. Cranston would not refuse to be called sinful, but refuse to confess his sin.

Mr. Cranston—I want to draw a line there, Mr. Moderator.

Miss Morton, one of the appellants, from her seat in the hall, said: When I entered this life, I presented my being to God, wanting to live a life pleasing to God, giving my life up to Him just to do as He liked. I was then conscious that my life was pleasing to God, conscious that God was in me, and that He lived in me. Since then I have felt condemned for confessing sin. I say this fearlessly. I remember the first time I had an experience of that kind. I was about to confess sin in a customary way, and in a moment I stopped.

The Moderator—That will suffice for an answer to Principal MacVicar's question.

At this point J. K. Cranston made the following statement:—

He said that it would be manifestly unfair for the Assembly to decide the case on the printed records and categorical answers to the questions as recorded at the trial by the Session and assessors. But that, in order to do justice to the appellants, their later statements must be taken into consideration, as the answers given at that trial did not fully express our views, and the record in one sense might be said to have been fallen from. If asked the questions again, both a Yes and No answer would be given, and then an explanation would have followed. But if we were confined to either an affirmative or negative answer, our former replies would have to stand. We do not believe in perfect holiness or sinless perfection in the sense that some of our answers would seem to imply, and the Assembly ought, to deal justly, to take into consideration our later statements and explanations, and nothing has been said in this court against these as being out of harmony with our church.

Rev. G. F. Bruce, Beaverton, said, in listening to the statement, he had heard the word "consciousness" very frequently used as holding the ultimate ground of evidence of the spiritual condition. Then he asked, "If a Christian clings to and puts his faith in consciousness, holding that he is free from sin, were we to understand that he is essentially free from sin?"

Mrs. Kay said: Take the case of telling a falsehood. Cannot I be conscious that I have told a falsehood? Cannot I be conscious that I love a falsehood?

J. K. Cranston answered that the consciousness was not the sole guide, but rather the Holy Ghost indwelling. Simplifying his answer, Mr. Cranston said that the consciousness was not the highest guide.

Rev. Dr. McMullen—The question is, Is your conscience a criterion to determine what your state is in God's sight?

Mr. John D. Cranston—Our consciousness is not the highest guide.

Rev. Mr. Bruce—On what grounds then is consciousness made to appear the sole ground?

Rev. Dr. McMullen—He repudiates that.

Rev. Styles Fraser—How then does the Holy Spirit reveal to them their condition?

Mr. John D. Cranston—The answer to that question is better realized than expressed. You know there are things in our inner consciousness we cannot begin even to express.

Rev. Dr. Cochrane asked: Can a believer be made perfect in holiness before the hour of death?

Mr. Cranston—There is a sense in which he can not. There is the growing in grace and knowledge, and being transformed from glory to glory, from image to image, as by the Spirit of God.

At the close of the questions the Assembly proceeded to argue the case and give judgment when Rev. Dr. Laing said they did not wish such cases to be brought before them, but this supreme court had the right to deliberate and pass judgment on such important questions, involving as even they did the peace of the Church as well as the purity of doctrine. He hoped to be able to speak of this case in a judicial manner without unnecessarily hurting the feeling of any one. A great deal of irrelevant matter had been brought out in the speeches. This was to be regretted as it should not have been brought in. He regretted that the record itself had not been perfect and without reflecting upon the appellants—for they were not to blame in this matter—it did seem strange that after the Synod had instructed the publication of the documents at the expense of the appellants, something more than the documents should have got before the Assembly. In the first place they had to look to the reasons of the appeal. Why were the appellants not satisfied with the decision of the Synod? Why had they come up before this court asking reconsideration of this case? In the first place, there had been no complaint on the part of the appellants as to any irregularity in the proceedings, and no complaint of any injustice having been done the appellants in the Synod. He thought substantial justice had been done in this case by the Session, the Presbytery and the Synod, and more especially by the Synod, from which the appeal had come to this supreme court. (Hear, hear.) He thought the treatment of the Synod had been kind and courteous. The next reason for the appeal must be the substance of the division. It was to this that the appellants had taken objection. The decisions were, first the decision of the Synod, which substantially said: "Dismiss the appeal and approve of the decision of the Presbytery." Then came the decision of the Presbytery, which said: "Dismiss the Appeal and sustain the action of the Session." The decision of the Session was the decision to which the appellants were taking objection. In this judgment there was a clear statement of the views of the appellants in reference to entire sanctification in this life culminating in the assertion that they had experienced a state in which they were without sin and had no sin to ask forgiveness of. Was this a fair statement of their views? was the question. According to the documents they did hold these opinions. These opinions were contrary to the Standards and they were dangerous in their tendency. He did not intend to enlarge on these points, because Drs. McLaren and Middlemiss

had satisfied all present that the views held by the appellants were contrary to the Standards. The appellants persisted in teaching these doctrines, and one of the appellants had told the court that he considered it his duty, almost as his mission, to testify to this grand truth and seek to raise religion into a higher sphere than it had attained in the past. The Session of Knox Church, Galt, had realized that if they did not take action they would themselves be responsible for this teaching, and the brethren and sisters were suspended accordingly. These errors had been taught by the appellants, and they had been even been taught in the Sabbath school. The appellants had not been excommunicated; they had been suspended. They had simply been disciplined as any other member of the Church in error would have been disciplined. These brethren and sisters had been offending against the Presbyterian Church. They might think so and they might not, but he (Dr. Laing) had to say that the offenders had been kindly dealt with. They would not submit and they had then been suspended until such time only as they might be brought into agreement with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. The Session had gone so far as to inform them that they could hold these views and remain within the Church if they would not propagate them. He (Dr. Laing) could conceive of no more tender way of dealing with the appellants in considering the offence. He desired to say that he felt gratified at several things in connection this painful duty. They had all felt, he thought, that there was something hopeful in the profession made by their appellants—that they were willing to learn. They had confessed that there were things which had puzzled them. They had acknowledged that they had not been able to discover the whole of these truths and they were willing to be taught. They had invoked the wisdom of the Church courts to direct them, and if disciplined might be able again to take up their places in the Church of God. Another thing which had pleased the speaker was the great unwillingness expressed by the appellants to leave the Church which they so much prized, and they said suspension would be a hardship. This was just what suspension was intended for. The discipline of the Church was now having its effect upon these appellants. They had felt that they had done something which the Church in the name of Christ had taken notice of, and they might honestly come back to work with the members of the Presbyterian Church in the service of the Lord. He said they had all been pleased with the demeanor of the appellants. He hoped they would now bow to the superior wisdom of the Assembly, the highest court of the Presbyterian body. The Assembly had heard nothing to lead them to suspect that the appellants would not submit to the ruling. He then moved the following resolution, which he said would be seconded by Chief Justice Taylor, of Manitoba: “Dismiss the appeal, sustain the decision of the Synod and the other courts by which the appellants are suspended from the Church privileges in terms of the judgment of the primary court, the Assembly affectionately beseeching the appellants prayerfully to consider their peculiar views and position in the light which has been cast thereon, and expressed the hope that they will respect and yield obedience to the judgment of the superior court and submit to the authority of the Session, so that they may continue to live in peace and love as members of the Church with which they have hitherto been as-

sociated, and the privilege of being connected with which they profess to highly prize."

Chief Justice Taylor, of Manitoba, reviewed the case on somewhat similar lines to those taken up by Rev. Dr. Laing. He was glad to see that the appellants had frankly answered questions put to them. What the Assembly really had to deal with was the action of the Session. He then dwelt upon the judgment of the Session of Knox Church, and agreed with that report that the teachings of the appellants were opposed to the Standards and the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. The Session would have failed in its duty if it had not taken steps to prevent these erroneous doctrines from being taught in the Presbyterian Church. He seconded the resolution made by Rev. Dr. Laing.

Rev. Mr. Ure rose to submit an amendment. He thoroughly agreed, he said, with the remarks of the mover and seconder of the resolution as to the brotherly kindness shown by the members of the courts in dealing with the appellants. While sympathizing with the general remarks of those speakers, and very largely with the motion also, he could not agree that they should consider simply the letter of the documents in the case. They should, he thought, consider the pleading in their own courts. It was true of all the courts of the Church, but especially of this Assembly, that it should deal with matters in the broadest and most generous Christian spirit. I think, he went on, that in this light we are of accord with these brethren in the views we cherish in regard to the Christian life. We all hold it as the blessed privilege of every child of God to carry in his bosom a sense of peace with God, that there is now no condemnation; and, further, I hope we agree that the child of God has the victory over sin in its power by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. We are at one in recognizing that the condition for entering upon this glorious experience is simply entire consecration of God. Then we are quite at one with them in the result that flows from these privileges—that joy which is the strength of God's people. But, in order to realize these advantages, we must carry with us day by day a deep sense of our dependence upon the blood of Christ. I shall not analyze sin; that has been well done by Dr. Middlemiss and Dr. McLaren. I have a deep impression that these dear brethren are very near to us in their sentiments if we could understand one another. Dr. McLaren mentioned that it was not a very high attainment to be free from cherishing sin in volition. But I go further and say that it is not a very high attainment for a Christian to rise superior to a sense of the rising of sinful desires looked at as positive transgressions of the law. Does that destroy the necessity of continually feeling our need of relying wholly upon the blood of Christ? By no means. The standard we have in view is absolute and entire perfection. Find out how deep is this influence which we call original sin, and the more we look at it the more we will be inclined to agree with Dr. Doddridge. "The best prayer I ever prayed to God in my life deserves damnation." The motion goes much in the line of my own sentiments, but there is something here (laying his hand on his heart) that rather rebels against it, and I would like some other step taken. I quite sympathize with the Session of Knox Church. If these brethren were pursuing divisive courses, so as to interfere with the harmony of the congregation, they should have been disciplined. I move in amendment,

That this case be referred to a committee, to be appointed by the Moderator, and this committee be instructed to bring in a report upon the case, such as the Assembly may take action upon at next or at a future sederunt.

At all events, that is a very safe kind of thing—(laughter)—it will not hurt anybody.

Rev. Dr. Laidlaw, of Hamilton, seconded the resolution in amendment. If we were simply to sustain the appeal, he said, we would be liable to place our Church in a position before the world in which she would be misunderstood and misunderstood concerning something vital to her welfare as a Church. Continuing, he pointed out that the appellants had in part fallen from the record. In that part to which they held the decision of the lower courts might be upheld and a commission might be appointed to instruct these brethren as to the attitude of the Church in relation to those matters in which they seemed to have difficulties. In reply to some murmurs of dissent he said he believed the Assembly could not have a nobler work to do than in thus instructing even a few brethren.

It was decided on appeal to the chair that this was not an amendment to the motion and must be voted on as a substantive motion before the resolution proper was taken up.

Rev. Principal Forrest thought that there would be no time for a committee to report before next year. If this was to be referred to a committee it should have been done before two days had been spent upon it. He thought no committee could take the responsibility of formulating a judgment on such a matter as this if the Assembly could not.

Rev. Dr. Duval contended that the Assembly was forging weapons to be used in the future. Simply to sustain the judgment of the lower courts would not place the Church clearly on record before the Christian people of the country.

Rev. Prof. MacVicar thought Dr. Ure's speech was an excellent one in support, not of Dr. Ure's motion, but of Dr. Laing's. To seek for a special deliverance seemed to him to overlook a certain book with which they were familiar, which covered as good a deliverance on this subject as they were likely to draw. If they sent the matter to a committee the position of the Church would be one of acknowledgment that a special deliverance was necessary. If the Session was at fault, let it so be stated; if not, it would be almost a calamity to leave it open to the inference that any Session had acted wrongly in such a case. Though the reference to a committee seemed a simple and easy way of dealing with the matter, thirty years' experience in Church courts had taught him that generally this was not the true way to deal with subjects of this kind.

Rev. Dr. King supported Dr. Ure's resolution. He spoke in terms of the highest praise of the statements of the representatives of the Presbytery of Guelph, Dr. Middlemiss and the Synod of Toronto and Kingston, Dr. McLaren, for their force and clearness and for their Christian spirit. He (Dr. King) was not largely actuated by what the public might think, feeling that people could not judge him harshly if he but tried to do his duty. There seemed to him important differences between the position of the appellants, as shown by the documents and that

shown by their explanations on the floor. He went on:—When a young lady stands up and says that “surrendering myself to God, I feel my whole nature so guided by His Spirit that when at the close of the day, in a kind of customary way I begin to confess sin, my conscience checked me and told me I should rather give thanks and praise to God,” surely if that be an error it is not one on the basis of which we should turn people out of the Church.

This statement was met with applause which the Moderator sought to check, and of the impropriety of which, in a judicial case of this kind, he at a later stage reminded the Commissioners.

Dr. King—Mark, mark, I believe it wrong. It is part of my humble duty in Manitoba to teach ethics. I have a text book written by a distinguished professor in the University of Edinburgh, a fellow-student of my own, who says “Moral quality is only predicable of acts of volition.” I think he is wrong. I teach that he is wrong; but are you going to turn people out of the Church because they have in the matter of sin the same views as Dr. Calderwood, of Edinburgh? (Laughter and applause.) You know that the holding of certain doctrines consistent with the Standards of the Church has never been made a term of membership in the Presbyterian Church, and I hope it never will. It was their teaching of these doctrines that was held to justify removing them from membership. After considering other minor points Dr. King proceeded: There is a great deal that is good in the spirit these brethren have shown, and we should try to guide it in the wisest way in a more judicious direction. One of them is said to have taught these doctrines in the Sunday School. The Session must control the teaching in the Sunday School, and it seems to me it would have been better to prevent the brethren teaching in any Church meetings until they had changed their views. If we could in some way get a deliverance sustaining, so far as the records are concerned, the deliverance of the Synod and yet refusing to proceed with the exclusion of these appellants and having some further dealings with them, I would cherish the hope that the Church might yet receive benefit from their influence and teaching and that they might receive benefit from the Church’s guidance.

The yeas and nays were taken on the amendment to refer the case to a Select Committee. Yeas, 75; nays, 90.

The Assembly then adjourned, the hour having arrived.

June 19, 1889, 9.30 A.M.

The Moderator then asked Dr. McMullen to take the chair, as the “Galt Heresy Case” was next on the order papers.

Dr. McMullen explained the stage which the case had reached. The Moderator had been handed a paper by the appellants, and asked advice from the Assembly as to what action should be taken in reference thereto.

A great deal of desultory discussion was indulged in as to the proper method to be followed and parties were recalled.

In answer to calls of “read” from the members the Moderator read the paper, which was as follows:—

MR. MODERATOR AND BRETHREN,—On behalf of the appellants

we desire to state that, as far as our intentions could make it possible, we have been loyal members of our Church, and have endeavored to labor for its prosperity, and are quite willing to abide by any decision that may be arrived at in the interests of peace and harmony and the prosperity of our Church, provided this decision does not rob us of our joy in God through the Holy Ghost which is given unto us, and the privilege to tell to others the glad news of Gospel truth. It was mentioned yesterday that it might be advisable to allow us to retain our membership in the Church of our choice, but to debar us from being teachers. As touching this point, we have to say that we have no inclination at this time to request being allowed to become teachers in the Sabbath School or in the congregational prayer meeting; but would like to understand what our privileges would be, were we allowed to retain connection with our Church. Would we be deprived the privilege of reading a scripture lesson, taking part in prayer or testimony? What latitude would be given us? If permitted to take part in any of the exercises at any meeting, we will in the future as in the past acknowledge the authority of the chair, and should we say anything which might be considered by such authority not to be in harmony with the truth as held by our Church, it would be a simple matter for him to check us, and we would quietly resume our seats. We cannot see what more could be gained by not allowing us to retain all the privileges of Church membership.

Yours faithfully,

J. K. AND J. D. CRANSTON,

On behalf of the Appellants.

Immediately on the reading of the paper being finished, fully a dozen members were on the floor, each calling at the top of his voice, "Mr. Moderator," etc.

The voice of President Forrest could be heard above the din, crying that if these people had offered to take this course before this trouble would have been avoided.

Rev. Mr. Jackson said the Session had time and again offered to restore the appellants if they would agree to desist from preaching their views, but they refused. He said that it was absurd to ask that the chairman of prayer meeting should rebuke them if they made a misstatement.

Mr. Moodie asked if they wanted to retain their membership, and still teach their doctrines outside the church.

Mr. J. D. Cranston thought this had been made sufficiently clear in the paper.

Mr. Moodie pressed for "Yes" or "No."

Mr. J. K. Cranston thought, as Dr. Ure and others pointed out yesterday, the difference, if any, between the teachings was very slight. They were substantially the same.

Mr. Moodie held that the evidence showed very different.

Dr. King had been delighted with the first part of the paper. He thought there was a strong desire shown for an amicable settlement, but three or four words had spoilt the whole thing. They promised to be obedient "in the future as in the past." It had been shown that their conduct towards the Session had not been obedient in the past. Was the measure of obedience in the future to be the same as in the past?

Mr. J. D. Cranston claimed that they had been obedient in the past. On one occasion he arose in the prayer meeting and asked leave to read a scriptural lesson. The leader asked him his object in reading the verses. He promised not to make one word of comment if allowed to read the verses, that the object was not for controversy, but was refused, and he immediately resumed his seat.

Mr. Moodie again pressed his question. Did they claim the right to promulgate their peculiar views while members of the Presbyterian Church?

Mr. J. D. Cranston claimed the privilege of preaching the truth, either to an individual or to a body of people, as God had revealed it to him, but if at any time he was told that that was not in accord with Presbyterian teaching he would take his seat.

Mr. J. K. Cranston was quite willing not to teach any dogmatic views concerning "inbeing sin," as he did not consider they were essential. The one thing they desired to teach was the necessity of receiving the promise of the Father the Comforter and walking in the Spirit, then the sin question would settle itself.

There being no farther questions to ask, the Moderator enquired if the paper would be considered one of the documents of the case, when it was decided not to so consider it.

Rev. Dr. Cochrane then moved the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Ball:—"Dismiss the appeal, and sustain the decision of the Synod and other courts, by which the appellants are suspended from Church privileges in terms of the judgment of the primary court. But in view of the fact that the statements and answers given by the appellants on the floor of the Assembly differ, in the judgment of many, in several important points, from the categorical answers contained in the printed minutes, and which were given to the Session before suspension; and further, in view of the earnestly expressed desire on the part of the appellants to continue to enjoy the privileges of membership in the Presbyterian Church, and that their conciliatory attitude before the courts gives hopes that they may now reconsider their position, and desist in future from propagating their peculiar views, the Assembly appoint the following assessors, to act with the Kirk Session of Knox Church, Galt, to meet with and deal further with appellants, should they so desire, with a view to their restoration to the fellowship of the Church."

In speaking to his resolution Dr. Cochrane said that he would

consider it a calamity if the decisions of the lower courts were reversed by the Assembly. It had been shown that the views of the appellants do differ materially from those of the Church. He thought that while the appellants should be dealt with in all kindness, yet the discipline of the Church must be maintained. The Assembly had the interests of the Church at large to look after. He would like to leave the way open for the restoration of the appellants to membership. His own opinion was that they did not know just what they believed. That they had, it seemed to him, stated one thing and on the same day denied the very same thing. If he held views differing from the body to which he belonged he would refuse to have his mouth muzzled, but would proclaim his views whenever an opportunity was presented.

Rev. W. S. Ball, in seconding the motion, said that he had had a long and pleasant interview with the appellants the evening before, and the paper presented by them bore traces of this interview. He took a very tender interest in the appellants. He was present twenty years ago when many of them were born again. He believed that if dealt with in the terms of Dr. Cochrane's resolution they would be brought back into the fold. It was somewhat unfortunate the influence which had been shaping their course of late. He believed that if they had continued under the tender influence of Dr. Smith the difficulty would have been settled.

Principal MacVicar considered that Dr. Laing's resolution covered all the ground. These people had found nothing new in theology. The Plymouth element made up the bulk of their addresses and statements. They said they were not guilty of sin unless they were conscious of sin. This did not agree with the words, "Who can understand his error?" or "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked," or "If a man say he has no sin he deceives himself." The apparent change in the views of the appellants were no improvement on those advocated before the Synod. He thought it would be unwise to throw the case back on the Session of Knox Church. It would be a source of continual wrangling and discussion, and for this reason he could not vote for the appointment of assessors. To make special terms and arrangements with the appellants, as asked in their paper, was to establish a system of disintegration within the Church.

Dr. Fraser, Hamilton, rose to do an act of justice. Mr. Ball had said that if the appellants had been under the care of the former pastor the trouble would not have happened. The fact was that the trouble had arisen under the old pastor and not under Mr. Jackson.

Rev. Dr. Laing then rose to close the debate. He believed in Church discipline. He thought the wholesome effects of discipline were already to be seen in the appellants. He knew parties that had held these same views thirty years ago, but by kindly

and prayerful dealings had got out of the bog, and he believed the defendants would soon be able to see their mistake and get back into the fold.

The vote was then taken, and Dr. Laing's motion was carried, the division on the main motion being 128 to 7.

Mr. J. D. Cranston then said that, anticipating from the discussion what the verdict would be, they had prepared the following statement :—

MR. MODERATOR AND BRETHREN,—On behalf of the appellants permit us to say, now that this case has been decided against us in the various courts of our Church, and no further appeal being possible, we have to say that it must be very apparent to those who have been watching this case that the decision which has been arrived at has been based on the records, meaning by that the answers given before the Session, and assessors of Knox Church, Galt, at *the inquisitorial trial* where we were practically confined to Yes and No answers, as has since been admitted by members of that court. And we cannot help but think that *injustice has been done us* by the majority of this Assembly. Our views we have stated fully, and fondly hoped, with Drs. Ure, Laidlaw, Duval, King and others, that a broad, generous Christian view of the case would have been taken, as we as Presbyterians are substantially in accord with the principles and doctrines of our Church. However, we bow to the decision of the highest court of our Church, believing, as we all do, that God's hand is in everything. In the future, as in the past, we shall, as far as our intentions can make it possible, be loyal adherents as in the past we have endeavored to be loyal members of our church. Thanking you on behalf of the appellants,

J. K. AND J. D. CRANSTON.

• THE SESSION HEARD FROM.

Rev. Mr. Jackson—Permit me to say that the Session and officers of Knox Church, Galt, are deeply grateful to the brethren of the Presbytery, the Synod and the Assembly for the interest and care with which they have considered this matter. I am also instructed to express deep regret that the time of the Assembly should be taken up by this matter, and to give the assurance that everything will be done in the Session that can be wished and by all the brethren who have spoken on the floor of the Assembly, and that the assessors will always be consulted in this place, that is, the assessors of the Presbytery. We hope to show that Knox Church is grateful for the kindness of the Assembly.

Rev. Dr. McMullen—I am exceedingly thankful that this protracted case is now closed. I have endeavored to discharge the duties of the Chair with the utmost impartiality. I am glad now, I assure you, to give place to the Moderator.

REMARKS.

We deem it only due to all parties concerned to make a few concluding remarks concerning the appellants in their present attitude as adherents in the Presbyterian Church.

It would be reasonable to ask the question, Why don't they leave altogether the services of this Church and unite with some other branch of the Christian Church more in harmony with their views of doctrine?

Now they frankly admit that this would be the proper, the honorable course to adopt, did they fully acquiesce in the findings of the Assembly as true to facts in their case.

But in spite of this decision, and in spite of all the arguments used by members of the different courts, they are still unshaken in their belief that they are substantially in accord with the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Ure struck the true note in the following words: "He had, however, a very deep impression that these dear brethren and sisters were very much more closely allied to them in sentiment at the bottom, if they could only get at the bottom of each other's minds in regard to these matters."

Yes, but can this note of harmony really be found? Well, they are prepared to wait in the firm belief that it will be found.

They can account largely for the vote of the Assembly by the mutual misunderstandings concerning the nature of sin.

The apparent lack of frankness, as evinced in our unwillingness to give Yes or No answers to searching questions concerning this intricate subject, was wholly interpreted against them.

The fact that their questioners had no difficulty in giving such answers themselves, must have seemed proof positive to some minds that there was something wrong.

Now this seeming want of frankness can be accounted for in two ways. In the first place, they had no clearly defined opinions concerning the line of demarcation between actual transgression—that which needs definite confession and forgiveness ere there can be peace with God and genuine hope of heaven—and that which, whether under the name of inbred sin, original sin, or sins of ignorance, does not call for definite confession or distinct acts of pardon, whatever may be believed or not believed concerning generalized confession or acknowledgment before God. Now, no man with any pretensions to ordinary wisdom is prepared to give Yes or No answers concerning any subject about which he has no clearly defined conviction or knowledge.

In the second place, they are well apprised of the fact that one of the generally understood differences between the teaching of Calvinism and Arminianism is concerning this very thing. Many holiness teachers of the Arminian class lay great stress on inbred sin as some entity that is taken out of the believer when entirely

sanctified, and hence these questions, if answered without explanations, were calculated either to involve them in admitting condemnation for actual sin when it did not exist, or on the other hand to make them seem to have adopted the Arminian views above mentioned when they were conscious that they had not. They believe that the Assembly were simply voting against the Arminian doctrine, believing that they discovered traces of it, if not the whole, in their answers.

They again and again tried to show that they confined themselves, as far as intention went, in their teaching and experience to that which was accepted as truth by all, viz., the gift and offices of the Holy Spirit; and the fact that no exception was taken to this teaching or experience proves to them that the whole issue turned on a subject concerning which they are certain that only misunderstandings exist, and not actual differences of opinion.

True it is that they witness to a decidedly improved Christian experience and life as the result of recognizing more fully the personality and offices of the Spirit, and true it is also that this improved spiritual life is calculated to awaken attention and often antagonism. It is really a disturbing element in Church life; for thereby inactive Christians who desire not to be spiritual are awakened from their sleep of carnal security. Members of the Church who strive to cover up any form of sin, and those who are unwilling to rectify wrong as a genuine mark of repentance, must and will find fault with it, and hence there will be, there must be, apparent trouble.

Now, this surface trouble naturally alarms many others, not of these classes mentioned, and hence widespread uneasiness arises from the simple fact that a stronger type of spiritual life is exhibited than that with which the Church is familiar, as a whole, and this accounts for a general desire for peace at any price.

But they rest in the belief that as time goes on and the predictions of the timid or of the rigidly orthodox concerning fanaticism and other forms of evil are not fulfilled, there will be a reconsideration of the whole subject to the advantage of all concerned.

That they have secured their heart's desire in Christian experience they are well assured of, and ask no snap judgment from any, the result of sympathy or partiality, so they advise all, Be not hasty in judging of this thing. "Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good."

An analysis of the voting makes its appeal to all against haste in this matter. True it is that there is a recorded vote of but seven in their favor, whilst 128 voted against them. But it will be noticed that, on the motion to send the case to a committee, 165 voted, so that at least thirty-seven refrained from voting finally against them.

If the experience they claim of "righteousness, peace and joy

in the Holy Ghost," as an unbroken, continuous fact from day to day and year to year, is really a possibility in life, it is decidedly worthy of the utmost efforts to secure it as a positive possession.

This their experience has been tried and stood the test to their satisfaction in times of comparative success. Perhaps it needs the furthertestof apparent failure. So they invite others with ourselves to examine and observe. If it be of man, it will not bear the strain; if of God, no weapon found against it can prosper.

From the *Presbyterian Review*, June 27th, 1889.

THE GALT APPEAL CASE.

[EDITORIAL.]

The business part of the three days of the General Assembly time was occupied in hearing the appeal of James K. Cranston and others against the decision of the Synod of Toronto and Kingston, by which some excellent men and women were suspended from church privileges by the Session of Knox Church, Galt.

To some it may seem to have been a waste of time, * * * nevertheless, the importance of the subject required that it should be carefully considered by the supreme court of appeal. *The patience of the court and the kind and brotherly tone of all the speeches were not more noticeable than the respectful demeanor of the appellants.* We cannot but hope that the result of this case of discipline will result for good in many ways to all concerned.

To prevent misconception it is our duty to state that while the appellants are not, in the opinion of the Church, right in the peculiar views, which they hold, no court of the Church has allowed any charge of unworthy—far less immoral—conduct to be made against them. They may be deceived as to their experience, but their outer life and conduct are in no way impugned, and we might go further and say, are admitted to be unimpeachable.

Now, as Dr. Ure said, is the doctrinal divergence very wide? and the editor might have added, as Dr. Ure said: "If at all, but he had a deep impression that these dear brethren and sisters are very near to us in their sentiments if we could just understand one another and get at the bottom of one another's hearts."

We think that beneficial results will come from this most interesting discussion.

‘Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good.’—I Thess. v. 21

THE

Expositor of Holiness

A CANADIAN MONTHLY MAGAZINE PUBLISHED
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE CANADA
HOLINESS ASSOCIATION, DEVOTED
TO HOLINESS AND EVANGEL-
ISTIC WORK.

ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

The Only Canadian Holiness Magazine.

CONTENTS.

The definite experience of holiness discussed in all its aspects, not only by accredited Canadian writers, but also in selections from the best writers of all countries.

OUR PLATFORM.

Catholic in Spirit—Loyal to Bible truth—Avoiding needless controversy which engenders strife—Not sectarian—Hence suitable to lovers of holiness in every denomination.

Clubs of four or more receive the Magazine at 75 cents each. The usual discount to agents.

Specimen copies sent free to any address. Send for one.

Address all communications to

REV. N. BURNS, B.A.,

207 BLEEKER STREET, - - - TORONTO, ONTARIO.

BOOKS ON HOLINESS.

Thoughts on Holiness. By Mark Guy Pearse. 35 cents.

Some Aspects of the Blessed Life. By Mark Guy Pearse. 35 cents.

Biblical Help Towards Holiness in Living and Happiness in Dying. By Jas. Morrison. 75 cents.

Perfect Love; or Plain Things for Those Who Need Them Concerning Christian Holiness. By Rev. J. A. Wood. \$1.00.

Purity and Maturity. By Rev. J. A. Wood. 75 cents.

WORKS BY REV. ANDREW MURRAY.


Holy in Christ. Thoughts on the calling of God's children to be holy as He is holy. 12mo, cloth, 90 cents.

The Children for Christ. Thoughts for Christian parents on the consecration of the the home life. 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Abide in Christ. Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God. 12mo, cloth, 90 cents.

With Christ in the School of Prayer. Thoughts on our Training for the Ministry of Intercession. 12mo, cloth, 90 cents.

Like Christ. Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Conformity to the Son of God. A sequel to "Abide in Christ." 12mo, cloth, 90 cents.

 Any of the above mailed to any address on receipt of price. Address,

WILLIAM BRIGGS,

Methodist Book and Publishing House, - - - Toronto.

"DIVINE GUIDANCE."

BY THE

Editor of "The Expositor of Holiness."

A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

Contains a full discussion of this important subject. Also a number of personal experiences of living witnesses.

Contains nearly Three Hundred Pages. Well Bound.

PRICE \$1.00.

Published by Rev. T. S. Linscott, Brantford

 Agents, address the publisher.

Those desiring the book direct, address

REV. N. BURNS,

207 Bleeker Street, Toronto.

Address all communications to

REV. N. BURNS, B.A.,

207 Bleeker Street, - Toronto, Ont.